DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 086 043 HE 004 889

TITLE Report of the Joint Committee on the Master Plan for Higher Education: California Legislature.
INSTITUTION California State Legislature, Sacramento. Joint Committee on the Master Plan for Higher Education.
PUB DATE Sep 73
NOTE 132p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$6.58
DESCRIPTORS *Educational Administration; Educational Finance; *Educational Objectives; Educational Planning; *Governance; *Higher Education; Interinstitutional Cooperation; *Master Plans; Statewide Planning
IDENTIFIERS *California

ABSTRACT

This report summarizes the conclusions and recommendations of the California Joint Committee on the Master Plan for Higher Education. Emphasis is placed on the primary purposes and objectives of California public higher education, structure, governance, coordination and planning, access and retention, cooperation between institutions, new directions, independent higher education, and financing. Appendices include recommendations, comments of committee members, public hearings of the committee, and joint committee documents and papers. (MJM)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ED 086043

REPORT OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE MASTER PLAN FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

CALIFORNIA LEGISLATURE

SEPTEMBER 1973

HE004889

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED 086043

REPORT OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE
ON THE MASTER PLAN FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

California Legislature

Assemblymen

John Vasconcellos
(Chairman)
Willie Brown
Raymond Gonzales*
Jerry Lewis
Ken Meade
John Stull**

Senators

Howard Way
(Vice Chairman)
Alfred Alquist
Dennis Carpenter
Mervyn Dymally
Albert Rodda

Patrick M. Callan, Consultant
Daniel Friedlander, Assistant Consultant
Susan Powell, Assistant Consultant
Nancy Wood, Secretary

September 1973

Permission is granted to reproduce this report. Single copies are available upon request. Comments and requests should be addressed to the Joint Committee, Assembly P. O. Box 83, State Capitol, Sacramento, California 95814.

*Member of the Committee since March, 1973
**Member of the Committee from March, 1971 to March, 1973.

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

September 15, 1973

Honorable Ed Reinecke, President
and Members of the Senate
Honorable Bob Moretti, Speaker
and Members of the Assembly
State Capitol
Sacramento, California

Ladies and Gentlemen:

In accordance with ACR 198 (1970 Session) and ACR 166 (1971 Session), we are transmitting the findings and recommendations of the Joint Committee on the Master Plan for Higher Education.

The report completes the Committee's charge. The recommendations included herein will shortly come before you in the form of legislation.

We hope the report will be widely disseminated, thoroughly discussed and fully implemented.

Respectfully submitted,

J Vasconcellos
John Vasconcellos,
Chairman

Howard Way
Howard Way
Vice Chairman

JV: HW: slb

FOREWORD

As members of the Joint Committee on the Master Plan for Higher Education, our signatures below indicate our individual acceptance and endorsement of this report, some with qualifications. Individual comments of members are included in the appendices.

ASSEMBLY MEMBERS

John Vasconcellos,
Chairman

Willie Brown
Willie Brown

Ray Gonzales
Ray Gonzales*

Jerry Lewis
Jerry Lewis

Ken Meade
Ken Meade

John Stull
John Stull**

SENATE MEMBERS

Howard Way
Howard Way,
Vice Chairman

Alfred E. Alquist
Alfred Alquist

Dennis Carpenter
Dennis Carpenter

Mervyn Dymally

Albert Rodda
Albert Rodda

*Member of the Committee since March, 1973
**Member of the Committee from March, 1971 to March, 1973.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE i

I. PURPOSES AND OBJECTIVES 1

II. STRUCTURE 3

III. GOVERNANCE 9

IV. COORDINATION AND PLANNING 19

V. ACCESS AND RETENTION 33

VI. COOPERATION BETWEEN INSTITUTIONS 49

VII. NEW DIRECTIONS 53

VIII. INDEPENDENT HIGHER EDUCATION 63

IX. FINANCING 67

AFTERWORD 79

APPENDICES:

A. Recommendations of the Joint Committee on the Master Plan for Higher Education 85

B. Individual Comments of Joint Committee Members 103

C. Public Hearings of the Joint Committee on the Master Plan for Higher Education 123

D. Joint Committee Documents and Papers 125

E. Notes 127

PREFACE

The Joint Committee on the Master Plan for Higher Education was created by concurrent resolution of the Legislature in September, 1970, and activated in March, 1971.

The Joint Committee began by inviting sixteen hundred Californians to advise us about the design of our study. We convened a two-day conference of ninety persons from all walks of California life for the same purpose. Our first public hearing was a symposium on the future of our society.

The Committee adopted a study plan in January, 1972. Since then we have conducted twenty-two public hearings (see Appendix C); sponsored a survey of institutional goals involving 24,750 persons and 121 public and private college communities; commissioned a series of papers which explore issues and discuss alternatives (see Appendix D); regularly met with the officials of California's higher education system; consulted with members of the executive and legislative branches of government and with many state and national experts who have researched and written about higher education; developed a mailing list of 4,500 concerned individuals and organizations; and read much of the higher education literature.

We were particularly fortunate to have had the benefit of the concurrent study by the Select Committee on the Master Plan for Higher Education. We operated in mutual respect, cooperated closely and exchanged all information. Their work has facilitated ours.

We have conducted our study within certain parameters. First, we concerned ourselves with the present and future of postsecondary education.* We tried to learn from history without wasting our energies praising or indicting the past. The fact that California probably has the finest system of higher education in the country is no guarantee for the future. Nor should the fact that changes are proposed in this report be interpreted as an indictment of the 1960 Master Plan. The significance of that document is virtually unchallenged in California and throughout the nation and the world. However, California's achievements in higher education, including the 1960 Master Plan, have been due in large part to men and women whose orientation was to the future and its needs and who were not content to rest on past accomplishments. Just as change for its own sake should be avoided, so should the unanalyzed assumption that what may have worked in the past is adequate for the present and future.

---

*"Higher education," generally used in this report encompasses public and private two-year and four-year colleges and universities. "Postsecondary education" includes higher education as well as private profit and nonprofit trade and technical schools and some apprenticeship programs.

Throughout our study we invited the participation of men and women of all ages, ethnic backgrounds, incomes, values, and convictions, including those most directly involved in higher education--educators and students.

We focused on those issues of public policy which are the legitimate concerns of the Legislature. We have no desire to manage higher education or to intrude in its day-to-day operations; yet we recognize the responsibility the Legislature bears in appropriating hundreds of millions of taxpayer dollars annually in support of California higher education.

Finally, in February, 1973, we issued a draft report with our tentative conclusions and recommendations. The report was circulated widely throughout California and was the subject of five public hearings and hundreds of letters and position papers.

This report draws together our final conclusions. The recommendations are the result of more than two years of study, public input and intensive deliberations among the members of the Joint Committee.

CHAPTER I

PURPOSES AND OBJECTIVES

Learning is the primary purpose of California public higher education. Educational institutions exist to respond to the learning needs of our citizens and society.

Learning prepares a person for life and work. It is a process involving intellectual and personal growth. Its function is to assist the individual to develop capacities for good judgment, personal responsibility, lifelong educability and career competence. Learning occurs throughout life and society, but is the special (though not exclusive) responsibility of educational institutions.

A closely related but distinct process, the discovery of knowledge, is another function of higher education. A third function is public service. However, the foremost purpose of each and every California institution of public higher education is learning.

Learning is facilitated by good planning. Too often both higher education and "master planning" have advanced the needs and aspirations of institutions, considering persons largely as abstractions and statistics to be matched with institutional vacancies. We reject that approach to education and planning.

We are a pluralistic society. Our citizens have diverse learning needs. A primary responsibility of higher education is to respect and compliment the individuality of Californians. A primary function of planning is development of an educational system with a broad range of choices available to each person.

However, policy-making, coordination and planning are necessarily the expression of assumptions, at least implicit, about purposes and objectives. California has no statement of goals for higher education.

> *Recommendation #1.* *The Legislature shall adopt a statement of legislative intent articulating broad statewide goals for California postsecondary education for the next decade, to include:*

A. *Academic freedom and responsibility;*
B. *Equal and universal accessibility for persons of both sexes and all races, ancestries, incomes, ages and geographies;*
C. *Lifelong learning opportunities for persons with capacity and motivation to benefit;*
D. *Diversity of institutions, services and methods;*
E. *Flexibility to adapt to the changing needs of students and society;*
F. *Cooperation between institutions in assessing area educational needs and resources, and meeting those needs;*
G. *Involvement with local communities in providing educational services and utilizing community resources in the educational process;*
H. *Increased understanding of the learning process--to be sought and applied throughout higher education;*
I. *Discovery of qualitative and quantitative evaluation methods for learning, research and teaching;*
J. *Accountability throughout postsecondary education including:*
   1) *accountability of institutions to the individual (for instruction and related services),*
   2) *accountability of institutions to the public and its representatives,*
   3) *accountability of the individual (faculty, student, staff) to the institutions, and*
   4) *accountability of the public and its leaders to the institutions (for support and development).*

CHAPTER II

STRUCTURE

Present Organization

California public higher education consists of three systems (segments) organized along functional lines.* This functional organization--commonly known as "differentiation of function"--was the basis of the 1960 Master Plan set forth by the Donahoe Act in the Education Code.

The differentiated functions are essentially a set of limitations upon the community colleges and the California State University and Colleges. The community colleges are restricted to offering vocational, collegiate and general instruction through the second year of college and community service. The California State University and Colleges are to offer undergraduate education and a variety of advanced training through the Master's degree. The University of California also provides undergraduate instruction and has exclusive jurisdiction over the doctorate, certain types of professional training and most research.

The rationale for assigning specific roles to each segment was to regulate competition among institutions trying to achieve comprehensive collegiate or university status. Such competition, if left unregulated during a period of enormous growth, would have resulted in duplication of effort.

Another rationale implicit in the Master Plan is that institutions performing similar functions should be grouped together for purposes of governance and administration. This grouping was expected to be both educationally productive and cost effective.

Criticism of Present Organization

The most telling criticism of the California system is its fragmentation of responsibility which has led to a critical absence of statewide coordination, planning and policy development.*

---

*The segments are the University of California, the California State University and Colleges, and the California Community Colleges.

Nearly as important, the current organization focuses the attention and energies of the segments on identifying and protecting functional differences, rather than on searching out areas and means of cooperation for more efficient achievement of common functions. At our committee hearings leaders of California higher education seemed more interested in institutional and segmental self-sufficiency than in coordination of educational services to benefit the people of California.

Institutional isolation and self-sufficiency is neither educationally nor economically sound. California's system of higher education must be viewed as a total resource to the state as a whole, and to each area in the state. Excessive emphasis upon institutional prerogatives and boundaries is a major barrier to maximizing the quality and quantity of education available to the people.

A closely related problem, particularly relevant to the University of California and the California State University and Colleges, is the tendency toward uniformity within these systems. Colleges and universities tend to be responsive to their segment rather than to the needs of specified clientele or areas. This tendency is reinforced by uniform administrative and budgetary practices.

Within some campuses and segments, there are differing structural arrangements such as cluster colleges. But the diversity is more form than substance. The potential for diversity is greatly undermined by standardized systemwide criteria for selection, retention and promotion of faculty. We find a disturbing lack of diversity within segments, with a tendency for most campuses to model themselves after a few prestigious institutions. High quality does not depend upon mechanical application of standardized criteria, whether the issue is institutional mission, budgeting, delivery of instruction, administrative staffing or selection of faculty. Diversification within segments is as important as differentiation between segments.

Alternatives Considered

The Joint Committee evaluated several structural alternatives to the current organization of California higher education. Like the present structure, each of these offers advantages and disadvantages. We considered two basic alternatives to the existing arrangement, each with several variations.

---

*See Chapter IV.

The first alternative is consolidation. This model would incorporate all public higher education under one statewide governing board. Or it might consolidate the University of California and the California State University and Colleges, leaving the community colleges locally controlled. The board could be imposed over existing boards, or it could replace them. Institutions of higher education might be grouped under the board on the present segmental basis or on a regional basis. This approach would deal dramatically with the critical problem of fragmentation of responsibility for policy, planning and coordination. It would probably diminish institutional barriers and boundaries, particularly if regional subunits were established.

However, the segments in their present form may already be too large to be manageable. Consolidation would probably accelerate unhealthy trends toward centralization, bureaucratic rigidity and distance between the place of decision-making and institutional clientele. It might also rekindle aspirations of some institutions and their communities for comprehensive college or university status.

The second alternative is elimination of multicampus systems. This alternative would make each institution autonomous under its own governing board. It would eliminate many of the disturbing trends toward centralization of authority in system offices with large administrative staffs. It could well facilitate diversity, especially by putting decision-making power much closer to persons thereby affected.

However, cohesive statewide policy and planning would be more difficult. There could be near anarchy in the budgetary process, with each college and university dealing directly with the Governor, Department of Finance and Legislature. The dissolution of multicampus systems would also remove the barriers to uncontrolled institutional aspirations for upward mobility.

Conclusions

No structural arrangement can insure enlightened policies.

Structural change of the magnitude required to reorganize a system as large and complex as California higher education would require enormous energy, time and resources. Such change would only be justified if it were the only way to produce more effective educational services for the people of California.

So, the basic issue before the Joint Committee was whether California public higher education can achieve the goals set forth earlier without a major structural overhaul.

We have repeatedly been assured that higher education as now structured can meet these challenges. We accept that assurance only conditionally. We conclude that the current structure can serve to meet California's goals only if two essential conditions are fulfilled.

- Major modifications must be made within the present organizational structure as proposed in this report;

- Educational leadership must be responsive to the public interest as well as to institutional needs.

It is critical that those educational leaders who have assured us of the present structure's capacity for flexibility and responsiveness work to insure the adoption and implementation of the needed modifications. The coming years will vigorously test that flexibility and responsiveness. Should the educational system prove unable or its leadership unwilling to respond to new goals and new policies, structural reorganization would be the next logical step.

In retaining the differentiation of function principle, we reaffirm the University of California's mission as "the primary state-supported agency for research." However, we are not convinced that every member of the University of California faculty should be funded at every point in his or her career as a half-time or more researcher. We believe the University should provide for the pursuit of excellence in both teaching and research. Certainly a good teacher must be current in his field. But there is not necessarily a correlation between excellence in teaching and excellence in published research. There should be a place in the University for a variety of faculty roles and provisions for faculty to alternate roles at different stages of their careers.

We likewise reaffirm the vital teaching mission of the California State University and Colleges. The recent attainment of University status ought and does not imply any change in mission. We are alarmed to find on some campuses that publication or Ph.D. requirements are given more significance than good teaching in employment, promotion and tenure.

> *Recommendation #2. The University of California may provide instruction in the liberal arts and sciences and in the professions, including the teaching professions. It shall have exclusive jurisdiction in public higher education over instruction in the profession of law and over graduate instruction in the professions of medicine, dentistry and veterinary medicine. It has the sole authority in public higher education to award the doctoral degree in all fields of learning, except that it may agree with the California State University and Colleges to award joint doctoral degrees in selected fields. It shall be the primary state-supported academic agency for research.*
>
> *Recommendation #3. The California State University and Colleges shall have as its primary function the provision of undergraduate instruction and graduate instruction through the Master's degree. Presently established two-year programs in agriculture are authorized, but other two-year programs shall be permitted only when mutually agreed upon by the Trustees of the California State University and Colleges and the California Community Colleges. The doctoral degree may be awarded jointly with the University of California or with a private institution of postsecondary education accredited by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges through the procedures established for new program approval. Faculty research is authorized to the extent that it is consistent with the primary function of the California State University and Colleges.*
>
> *Recommendation #4. Public community colleges shall offer instruction through but not beyond the second year of college. These institutions may grant the Associate in Arts and the Associate in Science degree. Their program*

may include but shall not be limited to: standard collegiate courses for transfer to other institutions; instruction in vocational and technical fields leading to employment; general or liberal arts courses; and community services.

Recommendation #5. *Within such differentiation of segmental function, the institutions shall undertake intersegmental cooperation when it can:*

A. *enhance the achievement of the institutional missions shared by the segments;*
B. *enable public and private postsecondary education to more effectively meet the educational needs of a geographic region; or*
C. *provide more effective planning of postsecondary education on a statewide basis.*

Recommendation #6. *The University of California and the California State University and Colleges should extend the principle of differentiation to campuses within their systems. The four-year segments should develop missions for their several campuses with more specificity and delineation than "general campus" and "statewide program."*

CHAPTER III

GOVERNANCE

Primary responsibility for governing California's large public systems of higher education resides in lay governing boards. The functions of the boards include providing leadership and protecting both academic freedom and the public interest.

Governing boards have had a key role in the development of California public higher education. These boards are the Regents of the University of California, the Trustees of the California State University and Colleges, the locally elected boards of the community college districts, and the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges.

In the decades ahead, governing boards will be faced with critical decisions of educational policy. It will be more important than ever that board members be highly competent and have credibility with the many constituencies of higher education--including the general public, elected officials, students, faculty and alumni.

The Joint Committee finds many of the provisions regarding the composition and appointment of governing boards inadequate for the present and the future. They were designed in the late nineteenth century and sufficed for an era in which higher education served a smaller, more homogeneous clientele and utilized fewer public resources.

New times call for new approaches. California has a more educated and informed citizenry. About seventy percent of the state's high school graduates go on to higher education. Colleges are expected to serve rich and poor, young and old, men and women, and people of all colors. A changed and changing society has new and divergent educational needs. Our state invests vast resources in its systems of higher education. Those systems have undergone tremendous growth and are highly visible to the state and nation. If higher education is to be responsive to the diverse needs of a pluralistic society, those who govern must be drawn from diverse backgrounds.

Appointments

Except for those serving in an ex officio capacity, all members of the governing boards are appointed by a single person, the Governor, subject only to Senate confirmation.* No matter who has been governor or what his party, many appointees have been influential supporters or friends of the governor who appointed them. A governor naturally tends to appoint persons who share his ideology. The typical appointee to a California governing board has been white, male, at least middle-aged, well educated and financially successful. Since each person is largely affected by his own experience, the result--despite sincerity, ability and goodwill--is uniformity rather than diversity.

We must, of course, strive to have our most qualified citizens serving on governing boards. But competence is not the monopoly of any one class or group. The Regents, Trustees, and members of the Board of Governors should better reflect the population of California with respect to their wealth, sex, ethnic background and age.

In short, our present selection method does not assure diversity or adequate independence from partisan political currents. The Joint Committee has reviewed alternatives to exclusive gubernatorial selection utilized by other states; such as, popular election (Illinois and Michigan), selection by the Legislature (North Carolina), and appointment by constituent groups (Pennsylvania). None of these alternatives seems appropriate to California.

The most effective course of action for California is creation of a broadly representative commission which presents the governor with a list of nominations for each vacancy. The governor then appoints from among those recommended. Senate confirmation would be eliminated.

> *Recommendation #7.* *Appointed governing board members of the three segments of higher education shall be selected by the Governor from a list of five persons submitted for each vacancy by a nominating committee.*
>
> *A. The nominating committee shall be composed of:*

---

*The Board of Regents consists of sixteen appointed and eight ex officio members; the Board of Trustees has sixteen appointed and five ex officio members; the Board of Governors is composed of fifteen appointed members.

1) *the Superintendent of Public Instruction (Chairman)*
2) *the Speaker and Minority Leader of the Assembly*
3) *the President Pro Tempore and Minority Leader of the Senate*
4) *the chairman of each segmental governing board*
5) *an alumni representative from each segment, chosen by alumni in a manner determined by each segmental governing board after consultation with alumni*
6) *a peer-selected faculty member from each segment, chosen in a manner determined by each segmental governing board after consultation with representative faculty organizations*
7) *a peer-selected student from each segment chosen in a manner determined by each segmental governing board after consultation with representative student organizations.*

B. *The alumni, faculty and student representatives on the nominating committee may not be members of segmental governing boards.*

C. *Committee members designated in A(4)-(7) above shall vote only on nominations for their own segmental board.*

D. *Senate confirmation of governing board members shall be eliminated.*

This proposal advances the causes of diversity, legitimacy and insulation from partisanship while retaining the ultimate appointment authority in the hands of the governor. It is patterned after a recent proposal for appointments to the judiciary and is an appropriate mechanism for selecting persons for positions of great public trust who are not responsible to the people through the election process.

All participants in the nominating and appointing process should be charged with assuring that governing boards are broadly and equitably representative of the people of California.

Recommendation #8. *Segmental governing boards shall be* *broadly representative of the general public including ethnic minorities and women.*

- *A. Both the nominating committee in preparing its list of nominees and the Governor in his appointing shall be responsible for compliance.*
- *B. The nominating committee shall be responsible for nominating a variety of persons of different backgrounds, ideologies and opinions.*

Terms of Office

The Regents currently serve sixteen-year terms, the Trustees serve for eight years and the members of the Board of Governors, four years. The Joint Committee finds no rationale in public or educational policy for different terms.

One argument often advanced in favor of sixteen-year terms is that they guarantee the board's insulation from partisan influence. However, revising the appointment process would provide better protection than excessively long terms.

Sixteen years does not guarantee that a two-term governor cannot exercise inordinate influence over a board. There are sixteen appointed members and eight ex officio members of the Board of Regents. In addition to the Governor, three other ex officio regents (Lieutenant Governor, Speaker of the Assembly, and Superintendent of Public Instruction) are popularly elected. These regents are often members of the same political party as the governor and are likely to follow his leadership. When they are combined with the number of gubernatorial appointees shown in the table below, the alleged protection proves illusory.

TABLE I

Governor	Terms	Regental Appointments
Culbert L. Olson	1939 - 1943	9
Earl Warren	1943 - 1953	15
Goodwin Knight	1953 - 1959	10
Edmund Brown	1959 - 1967	13
Ronald Reagan	1967 - 1972	9
	1967 - 1975*	11

*Terms of two regents will expire by 1974.

Another contention is that lengthy terms are required for board members to develop sufficient knowledge and expertise. However, the Joint Committee notes that the last four chairmen of the Board have been chosen by the Regents within four years of their initial appointments.

TABLE II

Regents	Appointed To Board	Served as Chairman of Board
Theodore R. Meyer	1962	1966 - 68
Dewett A. Higgs	1966	1968 - 70
William F. Smith	1968	1970 - 72
Dean A. Watkins	1969	1972 - Present

In determining the proper length of service, we deemed the following considerations most important:

- terms should be long enough to encourage a depth of knowledge and expertise, and

- terms should be short enough to allow for the frequent appointment of new members

The length of service for each governing board should be the same. While there is no perfect term, eight years is sufficient to meet the above criteria. Our decision is influenced by the experience of the California State University and Colleges. We find no evidence this board with its eight-year terms is less effective than the Regents.

Recommendation #9. *Terms of appointed Regents, Trustees and members of the Board of Governors shall be eight years.*

Composition

A governing board must have credibility with its constituency. In higher education students and faculty are a part of that constituency. Therefore, one student and one faculty member, each peer-selected, should be added to the three statewide boards. They would not vote but should have the right of full participation in all sessions.

Students and faculty representatives already participate in governance at many levels and have frequently taken part in meetings of governing boards. This involvement has generally enhanced board deliberations. The time has come to formalize and guarantee the participation of these groups.*

The Joint Committee has weighed the pros and cons of retaining the Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Superintendent of Public Instruction and Speaker of the Assembly as ex officio members of the boards. We believe there is value in some members being directly responsible to the people of California; on the other hand, there is risk of politicizing governing boards by their presence.

Absent a clearly better alternative, we make no general recommendation for removing ex officio members who are elected office-holders. However, we recommend replacing the Lieutenant Governor with the President Pro Tempore of the Senate. It is our belief that the Lieutenant Governor sits on the board as a legislative representative in his role as President of the Senate. The President Pro Tempore of the Senate would be a more appropriate representative. Additionally, in California history the office of Lieutenant Governor has almost always been filled by a man of the same party affiliation as the Governor. This tends to increase the Governor's influence over the boards.

Alumni representatives serve on governing boards with unique insight and understanding. They have no vested interest except in the welfare of the institution. Noting the contribution of alumni regents to the University of California, we believe alumni would serve valuably on the other statewide boards.

We find no justification for the special interest representation of the Mechanics Institute and the State Board of Agriculture on the Board of Regents. All members should represent the public at large.

> Recommendation #10. *The Board of Regents of the University of California and the Board of Trustees of the California State University and Colleges shall each consist*

---

*In June, 1972, the United States Congress enacted the higher education amendments which included the following statement: "It is the sense of Congress that the governing boards of institutions of higher education give consideration to student participation on such boards."

of the following twenty-two voting members and two nonvoting members:

- *A. The Governor, President Pro Tempore of Senate, Speaker of the Assembly and Superintendent of Public Instruction.*
- *B. The Chief Executive of the respective system*
  - *1) The President of the University of California shall be a regent.*
  - *2) The Chancellor of the California State University and Colleges shall be a trustee.*
- *C. An alumni representative of the respective system.*
  - *1) The alumni regent shall be the president of the University of California Alumni Association.*
  - *2) The alumni trustee shall be selected by alumni in a manner determined by the Trustees after consultation with California State University and Colleges alumni.*
- *D. Sixteen public members appointed in accordance with Recommendation #7.*
- *E. A peer-selected faculty member and peer-selected student of the respective system.*
  - *1) They shall be nonvoting members, with the right of full participation in all sessions.*
  - *2) Selection procedures shall be determined by the Legislature after consultation with student and faculty representatives.*
- *F. The representation of the Mechanics Institute and the State Board of Agriculture on the Board of Regents shall be eliminated.*

Recommendation #11. The Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges shall consist of the following:

- *A. Sixteen public members appointed in accordance with Recommendation #7.*
- *B. One alumni representative appointed in accordance with Recommendation #7.*
- *C. A peer-selected faculty member and peer-selected student shall be nonvoting members with the right of full participation in all sessions. The procedure for selection shall be determined by the Legislature*

after consultation with student and faculty representatives.

Conflict of Interest and Disclosure

Public confidence requires that persons serving on governing boards be above reproach and that they be perceived by the public as above reproach. Appropriate conflict of interest and disclosure provisions are needed.

> *Recommendation #12.* *The Legislature shall provide conflict of interest and disclosure provisions for members of segmental governing boards.*

Responsibilities and Powers

The Joint Committee does not wish to alter the fundamental relationship between the state and the two statewide and state-supported systems of higher education.

The University of California is a constitutional entity. The California Constitution does more than grant recognition, in essence it establishes the University as a separate branch of government. It gives the Board of Regents full powers of governance subject only to specified limitations.

However, there are at times overriding issues of statewide concern involving California's total higher education effort. While the Joint Committee does not propose fundamental change in the responsibilities and powers of the Regents it notes one exception justified by the need for a coordinated statewide policy. We do not believe the Regents should be the agency to determine whether or not students shall be charged for instruction and instructional facilities and the amount of any such charges.

The powers of the Trustees of the California State University and Colleges should continue to be determined and delegated by the Legislature.

The Regents and Trustees should continue to exercise their current governance responsibilities except as otherwise specified in this report.

> *Recommendation #13.* *The University of California shall be constitutionally autonomous. The powers of the Regents shall remain as currently specified except with respect to student charges for instruction and instructional facilities.**

Multicampus Systems

A major but largely unrecognized trend of the last decade has been the concentration of large numbers of campuses under central administrative offices. In California, under the Master Plan, the two statewide four-year systems have grown enormously.

The multicampus systems have contributed to the orderly growth of public higher education--particularly in the areas of planning, resource allocation and achieving economies of scale. However, they have also added considerable bureaucratic apparatus to higher education. Despite significant efforts to decentralize, there is still a preponderance of administrative centralization.

There is currently no evidence available on the optimum size of multicampus systems. Unfortunately, neither statewide segment has addressed this subject in an analytical way. The Joint Committee recognizes this as an extremely complex problem with many variables. Policy-makers in higher education and state government must learn about the impact of size in order to make rational decisions about such issues as governance, administration and structure. We can no longer afford an uncritical attitude towards growth, expansion and size of campuses and systems. We urge the appropriate agencies to make such an analysis.

Decentralization of Governance

We believe the University of California, the California State University and Colleges and the large multicampus community college districts should undertake controlled experiments in decentralization of governance.

---

*See Recommendation #41.

One approach, suggested in our Draft Report, would be the creation of local boards with final authority over such matters as campus architecture (design only), buildings and grounds and personnel. The local board's concurrence might also be required in the appointment of a campus chief executive. In addition, the local board could serve as a liaison between campus and community and as guardian of the unique character of each campus. It would be important that local boards' authority be delegated by the governing boards and not taken from administrative powers now held by campus chief executives.

We are dismayed by the reaction of the segments to this suggestion. They have indicated an unwillingness to even experiment with decentralization. We are reluctant at this time to mandate decentralization. However, this may be the only alternative in the future.

The University of California expressed some degree of willingness to experiment with local advisory boards. Similar boards already exist at the California State University and Colleges. However, boards which are only advisory cannot effectively serve as more than public relations and fund-raising bodies. Such boards have sometimes been effective in accomplishing limited objectives, but they have not served to place important decisions closer to the persons affected by them.

There are many ways local boards could be selected. However, we believe they should combine representation from the campus, the local community, and the state at large (for campuses which serve the entire state).

In summary, local boards could free the energies of segmental boards from parochial matters and enable them to focus more intensively on issues of systemwide policy. Boards with enormous responsibilities too frequently bog down with matters better decided locally.

CHAPTER IV

COORDINATION AND PLANNING

Coordination is the critical element in a multisystem organization of postsecondary education. California needs an independent agency capable of articulating statewide needs and providing advice to the segments and elected public policy-makers. This agency must have the responsibility and authority to coordinate so as to avoid unnecessary duplication and to foster diversity.

Comprehensive planning is the most crucial aspect of coordination, since it provides the basis for all other functions of coordination. Effective statewide planning should:

- optimize the use of resources
- assure diversity of institutions and programs
- provide for systematic development of new approaches and delivery systems
- maximize informed student choice within limited resources
- maintain policy options for the future
- identify and respond to future educational and societal needs.

The planning required for the decades ahead must be qualitative as well as quantitative, concerned with ends as well as means of postsecondary education. It must avoid the pitfall of mechanically extrapolating present trends and assumptions into the future, thus locking postsecondary education into patterns which may be neither relevant nor economically sound.

We need an integrated planning process which will take all our educational resources and present and projected future needs into account. Planning should be statewide, regional and segmental. It should be a continuous process, rather than a permanent plan only periodically reviewed.

The federal Education Amendments of 1972 recognize this, and provide for establishment of state postsecondary education commissions with responsibility for statewide planning. Under this legislation such a commission is required to qualify a state for federal assistance. The major thrust is that state planning must encompass all of postsecondary education. The commission must be:

> broadly and equitably representative of the general public and of public and private nonprofit and proprietary institutions of higher education--including community colleges, junior colleges, postsecondary vocational schools, area vocational schools, technical institutes, four-year institutions of higher education and branches thereof.

The legislation also requires designation of a state agency to administer occupational education plans developed by the state postsecondary education commission.

The Situation

The principal systemic deficiencies of our segmental organization are inadequate coordination and planning.

Short of the Governor and the Legislature, no agency has the capacity to coordinate and develop comprehensive higher education policies for the state. After more than a decade under the celebrated Master Plan, California has no comprehensive state plan, no statewide planning process, and no comprehensive information system to provide policy-makers with accurate and comparable data on programs, costs, and flow of students.

Regional planning is nonexistent, except in a few highly specialized instances. Limited planning has occurred at the segmental level. Not surprisingly, its concern has been primarily with segmental interests and aspirations. Without a coordinated state approach, segmental planning can only be fragmentary and cannot assure quality and quantity of educational services to the people of California. In times of abundant resources such fragmentation may go unnoticed. In times of scarce resources, as the state needs to maximize educational opportunities and benefits, it is intolerable.

The "master plan" concept is no longer useful. It implies a rigidity which undermines the flexibility necessary for adaption to changing needs of students and society. It tends to foreclose future options at the time we need most to enhance them. In times of increasingly rapid change, any predetermined "plan" is by nature too static. We need instead a continuous planning process.

Such a process necessarily includes periodic long-range planning. Long-range planning should include an evaluation of the fundamental goals and assumptions of public postsecondary education; its organization, governance and planning mechanisms; and the functions of all institutions, segments and agencies. It should occur every ten years through a public process involving lay persons, students, faculty, administrators, and governing board members. It should be conducted by the Legislature.

The ongoing planning process should involve the public segments and institutions and, when appropriate, private institutions of postsecondary education and interested state agencies involved in postsecondary education. It should be concerned with implementation of long-range goals (such as those proposed in Chapter I), projections of enrollments and costs, programmatic needs, budget formulae, management systems and other vital subjects.

> *Recommendation #14.* *The "Master Plan" approach shall be replaced by a continuous planning process which includes:*
>
> A. *A legislative study of California postsecondary education at ten-year intervals to reevaluate the planning process and provide guidelines regarding goals, societal needs and general missions of public higher education and its components.*
>
> B. *Continuous planning by a state commission including a five-year plan which is to be updated annually.*

The Solution

California must have a suitably sensitive mechanism to provide the necessary coordination and continuous planning and to meet federal requirements.

A dozen years ago California attempted to establish a sensitive and delicate balance between segmental autonomy and statewide coordination by establishing the Coordinating Council for Higher Education. However, almost from the beginning the composition and powers of the Council rendered it inadequate. The Master Plan Survey Team (composed of institutional representatives) proposed that the membership of the Council be entirely institutional representatives. It explicitly provided that the director and staff of the Council were not to be "leaders of higher education."[1] The Council has never fulfilled the function of statewide planning and policy development and has never been equipped to do effective statewide coordination.

In creating the Council the Legislature added three public members, and more recently restructured it with a majority of public members. This has added somewhat to its effectiveness. Yet throughout the Council's history the segments have dominated it; its director and staff have not been selected from among educational leaders; and it has not gained the necessary credibility. There is little indication the Council can become the effective instrument needed for coordination and planning.

We conclude, therefore, that significant revision of the statewide planning and coordination mechanisms and practices is required.

> *Recommendation #15. The Coordinating Council for Higher Education shall be abolished.*

One possible remedy for a system dominated by segmental rivalries and poor planning and coordination is consolidation of all or most public postsecondary education under a "superboard"--a board which both governs and coordinates. We have seriously considered this alternative and we have noted that several other states have recently moved in this direction. But we are not convinced a superboard is best for California. Postsecondary education in California is already too bureaucratic. The number and size of our postsecondary educational institutions makes consolidation and centralization undesirable.

We believe that the coordinating agency model is still most appropriate for California. We recommend the establishment of a new coordinating and planning agency, the Postsecondary Education

Commission, to replace the Coordinating Council. The Commission should:

- be broader and more diverse in its composition;
- have an explicit mandate from the Governor and Legislature as to its functions;
- have the same flexibility in recruiting staff as the public segments;
- include the full spectrum of postsecondary education.

This approach would leave the segmental structure intact. Governing power remains with the segmental governing boards; there is no centralization of governing authority. Rather, it provides a commission with sufficient authority to conduct continuous comprehensive statewide planning and to provide credible and independent advice to the Governor and the Legislature. Its effectiveness depends not upon its power to govern, but upon the quality of its advice.

There are clear and crucial distinctions between our proposal for the Postsecondary Education Commission and a superboard. The latter has full responsibility for governance and administration of the institutions under its jurisdiction including policy initiation and personnel management; a coordinating and planning commission does not.

Effective coordination and planning does, however, require some subordination of segmental and institutional prerogatives in the interests of overall state educational policy.

A coordinating board must occupy the middle ground between the postsecondary education community and state government. If it fails to effectively perform its sensitive missions, a vacuum is created. Such a vacuum invites and even necessitates assumption of the coordinating role by the Governor and Legislature, as well as more drastic structural reform.

In short, effective coordination and planning require high quality educational leadership. The proposals offered here provide a structure and environment for such leadership. But the crucial ingredient--academic statesmanship which places the common good above parochial interests--must come from California's postsecondary education community.

The responsibilities of the Postsecondary Education Commission should include:

- continuous and comprehensive statewide planning
- coordination of public and private postsecondary education
- administration of federal programs channeled through state government
- approval/disapproval of proposals for changes in admissions policies of public segments or institutions therein
- encouragement of interinstitutional cooperation and consortia, particularly on a regional basis
- determination of need for new campuses
- review of any proposed new unit of instruction, research or public service
- initiation and coordination of segmental reviews of existing programs.

The Commission should have constitutional status, to guarantee parity in stature with the segments it coordinates. To assure maximum flexibility, provisions for its functions, membership and powers should be statutory. The Commission must have power to obtain all necessary information from the segments, and to require it in forms allowing comparability of data. So that it may provide educational leadership, its professional staff should be exempt from civil service regulations (as are the staffs of the University of California and the California State University and Colleges).

Recommendation #16. There shall be a Postsecondary Education Commission created, with constitutional recognition.

A. *The Legislature shall determine the membership, powers and functions of the Commission.*

B. *The professional staff of the Commission shall be exempt from civil service regulations.*

C. *The Commission shall have the power to require the governing boards and the institutions of public postsecondary education to submit data on plans and programs, costs, selection and retention of students, enrollments, plant capacities and other matters pertinent to effective planning, policy development, articulation and coordination.*

Recommendation #17. *The Postsecondary Education Commission shall be established with the following functions and responsibilities in its capacity as the statewide postsecondary education planning agency and advisor to the Legislature and Governor:*

A. *It shall require the governing boards of the segments of public postsecondary education to develop and submit to the Commission institutional and systemwide long-range plans in a form specified.*

B. *It shall prepare a five-year state plan for postsecondary education which shall integrate the planning efforts of the public segments and other pertinent plans. Conflicts or inconsistencies among segmental plans shall be resolved by the Commission in consultation with the segments. If such consultations are unsuccessful, the Commission shall report the unresolved issues to the Legislature with recommendations for resolution.*

  1) *The state plan shall include, but need not be limited to, consideration of the following:*
    - (a) *the need for and location of new facilities,*
    - (b) *the range and kinds of programs appropriate to each institution or system,*
    - (c) *the budgetary priorities of the institutions and systems of postsecondary education,*
    - (d) *appropriate levels of fees, tuition and other student charges, and the impact of such charges on students and on*

postsecondary educational programs and institutions,

(e) appropriate levels of state-funded student financial aid,

(f) access and admissions of students to postsecondary education, and

(g) the provisions differentiating the functions of the public systems of higher education.

2) It shall update the state plan annually.

C. *It shall advise the executive and legislative branches at appropriate stages in the budgetary process as to whether segmental budgetary requests are programmatically compatible with the state plan. It is not intended that the Commission hold independent budget hearings.*

D. *It shall determine the need for and location of new institutions and campuses of public higher education. (The Legislature shall reaffirm its intent not to authorize or acquire sites for new institutions of higher education unless recommended by the Commission.)*

E. *It shall review segmental proposals for new programs and make recommendations regarding funding to the Legislature and the Governor. ("New Programs" means all proposals for new schools or colleges, all programs leading to a graduate or undergraduate degree which have not appeared in a segment's academic plan during the previous two years, and all proposals for new research institutes or centers which have not appeared in a segment's academic plan during the previous two years.)*

F. *It shall, in consultation with the segments, establish a schedule for segmental review of selected educational programs, evaluate the program review processes of the segments and report its findings and recommendations to the Governor and the Legislature.*

G. *It shall serve as a stimulus to the segments and institutions of postsecondary education by projecting and identifying societal and educational needs and encouraging adaptability to change.*

H. *It shall develop and submit plans to the Legislature and the Governor for the funding and administration of a program to encourage innovative educational* programs by institutions of postsecondary education.

I. It shall collect and/or conduct studies of projected manpower supply and demand, in cooperation with appropriate state agencies, and disseminate the results of such studies to institutions of postsecondary education and to the public in order to improve the information base upon which student choices are made.

J. It shall periodically review the need for and availability of postsecondary programs for adult and continuing education and develop guidelines for the establishment of such programs.

K. It shall develop criteria for evaluating the effectiveness of all aspects of postsecondary education, whenever possible, basing evaluation criteria upon qualitative and quantitative programmatic outcomes.

L. It shall maintain a current inventory of all off-campus programs and facilities for education, research and community service operated by public and private institutions of postsecondary education.

M. It shall act as the official state clearinghouse for postsecondary education information and shall provide information as requested to the Legislature, the Governor and appropriate agencies. It shall develop a comprehensive data base insuring comparability of data from diverse sources.

N. It shall develop criteria for state support of new and existing programs in consultation with the public segments, the Department of Finance and the Joint Legislative Budget Committee.

O. It shall approve or disapprove all proposals for changes in eligibility pools for admission to public institutions of postsecondary education.

P. It shall report annually, with recommendations, to the Legislature and the Governor regarding the financial conditions of independent institutions, their enrollment and application figures, the number of student spaces available and the respective cost of utilizing those spaces as compared to providing additional public spaces.

Q. It shall, upon request of the Legislature or the

Governor, submit to the Legislature and the Governor reports on matters pertinent to statewide postsecondary education planning and coordination; it may from time to time, submit to the Governor and the Legislature reports containing recommendations on necessary or desirable changes in the functions, policies and programs of the several segments of public and private postsecondary education.

R. *It may undertake such other advisory and information gathering functions and responsibilities as are compatible with its role as the statewide postsecondary education planning agency.*

S. *It shall assume responsibilities heretofore assigned to the Coordinating Council for Higher Education through legislative resolution and budget language.*

Membership

To be an effective planning and coordinating agency, the Commission must enjoy the confidence of the legislative and executive branches of state government, as well as the institutions and segments of postsecondary education. The best way to assure the former is to share the public appointments between the two branches of government. The best way to assure the latter is to include representatives of all types of postsecondary educational institutions.

The Postsecondary Education Commission should have a clear majority of public members whose sole commitment is to the citizenry of California and the quality of education, rather than to particular institutions. And while the institutions ought to be represented, the institutional representatives should be members of segmental governing boards rather than administrative officers so that the responsibility of all Commission members is primarily to the public. Lay persons can serve the dual role of public and institutional representatives, and their presence on the Commission will provide valuable liaison with the governing boards. So the board should be composed entirely of lay persons.

Rather than serving on the Commission itself, segmental chief executives should constitute one of several committees advisory to the Commission. Other committees should include professional educators and students.

Recommendation #18. *The Postsecondary Education Commission shall be composed of:*

- *A. The chairmen of the Board of Regents of the University of California, the Board of Trustees of the California State University and Colleges, and the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges, or their designees from among the appointed members of their respective boards, serving at the pleasure of the appointing authority.*
- *B. A representative of nonprofit independent higher education, appointed by the Governor for a three-year term, from a list submitted by an organization representative of those institutions.*
- *C. The chairmen of the California Advisory Council on Vocational Education and Technical Training and the Council for Private Postsecondary Education Institutions or their designees from among the other members of their respective councils, serving at the pleasure of the respective appointing authority.*
- *D. The President of the State Board of Education or his designee from among the other members of the board, serving at the pleasure of the appointing authority.*
- *E. Twelve representatives of the general public appointed for six-year terms as follows: four by the Governor, four by the Senate Rules Committee and four by the Speaker of the Assembly.*

Members of the Commission shall not be employees of any institution of postsecondary education.

The Commission shall be selected so as to be broadly representative of the population at large in terms of sex, race and economic and ethnic background. The appointing authorities shall confer to assure that their combined appointments comply.

Legislative Responsibility

The Legislature, as a vital link in providing postsecondary education for Californians, also needs special competence. Especially with increasing federal involvement, expertise on higher education policy matters must be readily available within the Legislature. Additionally, such expertise would enhance the Legislature's capacity to sensitively fulfill its responsibility.

> *Recommendation #19.* *The Legislature shall improve its policy staff capacity in postsecondary education.*

Federal Legislation

The federal Education Amendments of 1972 call for state postsecondary education commissions and for a state agency to administer certain programs of aid to community colleges and occupational education programs. Up to now the aid programs have not been funded nor has federal assistance been provided for the state commissions. However, we believe the basic thrusts of the requirement for state commissions is sound and that California should move to implement the concept irrespective of the availability of federal funding.

California's Postsecondary Education Commission should also be the agency charged with fiscal management and administration of federal aid for community colleges and occupational education as prescribed in the 1972 Education Amendments. This is an appropriate function for the commission and it will avoid a proliferation of state agencies in the field of postsecondary education.

> *Recommendation #20.* *The Postsecondary Education Commission shall have the following responsibilities under PL 92-318 (Education Amendments of 1972).*
>
> *A. It shall be designated the "State Postsecondary Education Commission" under Section 1202 with the following functions and powers:*
>
> *1) Comprehensive statewide planning for postsecondary education (all functions and duties delineated in Section 1203 of the Education Amendments of 1972).*
>
> *2) Statewide planning for and establishment of an advisory council on community colleges*

(all functions and duties in relation to Title X, Sections A and B of the Education Amendments of 1972).

3) *All functions and duties in relation to the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963, Titles I and IV as amended, and Title I (Continuing Education) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 as amended.*
4) *Commenting to the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare on proposals for the improvement of postsecondary education (for reviewing and recommending functions required by Section 404 (b) of the Education Amendments of 1972).*
5) *Affirming when appropriate that an institution of higher education applying for federal emergency assistance is in distress (the functions and duties required of "the appropriate State agency" as designated in Section 122 (b) (2) of the Education Amendments of 1972).*

B. *It shall be designated the agency responsible for fiscal management and administration of federal aid for community colleges and occupational education under Section 1055 of the Education Amendments of 1972.*
   1) *This agency shall be charged with the sole administration of the plans for occupational education developed by the 1202 Commission (Title X, Section B.)*
   2) *To aid in the administrative and fiscal duties imposed by Title X, Section B on the 1055 agency, the Commission should establish a panel of such persons from the postsecondary community as it deems appropriate. (Section 1055 requires the continued use of the existing State Advisory Council on Vocational Education with the same responsibilities as provided in the Vocational Education Act of 1963).*

Central Offices

In order to facilitate the proximity and interrelationships critical to effective coordination and planning, the Commission and the central office of each public segment should be located in Sacramento.

Recommendation #21. *The Postsecondary Education Commission and central offices of all public segments of postsecondary education shall be located in Sacramento.*

CHAPTER V

ACCESS AND RETENTION

In the 1960 Master Plan for Higher Education, California committed itself to provide a place in higher education to every high school graduate or eighteen-year-old able and motivated to benefit. California became the first state or society in the history of the world to make such a commitment. We reaffirm that pledge.

> *Recommendation #22.* *The Legislature shall reaffirm the commitment of the State of California to provide an appropriate place in California public higher education for every student willing and able to benefit from attendance.*

The Master Plan specified that relative high school academic achievement, as defined by each segment, would determine access to the University of California (top 12 1/2%) and the California State Colleges (top 33 1/3%). Prior to the Master Plan, the University accepted its students from about the top 15% and the state colleges from approximately the top 50%. The Master Plan recommended 2% exceptions per year in freshman admissions. This was raised to 4% in 1968, with at least half the exceptions reserved for disadvantaged students.

The Master Plan also specified that community colleges should continue to admit any high school graduate or other person over eighteen years of age capable of profiting from the instruction offered. The Master Plan Survey Team decided that:

> so long as any high school graduate can be admitted to a junior college, it will not reduce opportunity for students willing and able to meet the requirements for transfer to the upper division in the state colleges and the University of California.[1]

The intent of the authors of the Master Plan was to raise admissions standards in the four-year institutions and thereby divert 50,000 students to the community colleges. They believed this would raise the quality (apparently equated with selectivity) of the four-year colleges and universities.

The Master Plan Survey Team left no comprehensive record of the assumptions underlying its admissions quotas. However, our analysis of the Master Plan and supporting documents suggests the following assumptions were implicit:

- institutional aspirations for greater selectivity should be encouraged
- the specific quotas 12 1/2% and 33 1/3% could be justified by matching institutional and fiscal resources with projected demands (though rigorous evidence was lacking)
- efficiency in education could best be realized by separating students on the basis of academic ability as conventionally defined (high school grades, class standing and test scores)
- the quality of an educational institution is highly correlated with the quality (again measured by conventional standards) of the students admitted
- the "best" students should have the greatest range of educational options and should receive the "best" education (in terms of dollars spent per student and prestige of the institution)
- segregation of students by ability would minimize dropout rates in the four-year, more expensive institutions
- students begin college immediately upon completion of high school.

Several of these assumptions are at least questionable today. The most serious criticism is that the assumptions were dictated by institutional aspirations rather than by individual needs or any well articulated educational philosophy.

In addition, there is a growing body of educational research which indicates that the most selective colleges have the least effect on students. Highly selective institutions make only a slight difference in the student's college achievements (academic and extracurricular), academic ability, likelihood of completing college, level of education achieved and choice of career. There is almost no empirical basis for the contention that segregating students by ability, as measured by high school achievement, is educationally more effective than other approaches. Neither is there evidence that the standard instruments for predicting college success (grades and standardized tests) are the best possible measures of academic potential. Additionally, the success of specially admitted students raises serious questions about exclusive reliance upon conventional predictive criteria.

In short, we have much to learn about how to match students with institutions which meet their educational needs and capabilities. The most critical element is probably motivation, which is also the most difficult quality to measure. As a spokesman for the California State University and Colleges put it: "Studies involving the predictive power of various preadmissions indices show that in general there has been little improvement made over the past 50 years."[2] We do know that the criteria currently in effect are very highly correlated with ethnic and economic background.

Finally, we note the trend towards defining and utilizing educational outcomes as a basis for evaluation (and financing) of higher education. This makes it questionable whether institutions which accept and graduate the students most likely to succeed (and spend more dollars per student) should be regarded as the "best." As one educational researcher recently put it, "...the best way to graduate a bright class is to admit a bright class."[3] But what does this say for the impact of the institution?

In the past, high status has too readily and simply been accorded the institutions which admitted only the "best qualified" learners. Perhaps in the future, the quality of education will be measured instead in terms of "value added." This would emphasize the process of education and take into account what happens to the student between entrance and graduation.

Integrated Admissions Policies

Any alteration of admissions criteria by one institution or segment will impact on the entire system of postsecondary education. These decisions, therefore, should not be made autonomously. It is necessary to establish some central regulation over these policies to assure overall patterns of equal access and to prevent unbridled competition for students. Therefore, we propose that the Legislature initially define the undergraduate eligibility pools for all public segments and that changes in the pools be subject to approval by the Postsecondary Education Commission.

Recommendation #23. The following admissions criteria shall be adopted:

- *A. The California Community Colleges shall accept all applicants who are high school graduates and all adults who can benefit from the instruction offered.*
- *B. The California State University and Colleges shall select first-time freshmen from among the 33 1/3% of high school graduates most capable of benefiting from the instruction offered.*
- *C. The University of California shall select first-time freshmen from among the 12 1/2% of high school graduates most capable of benefiting from the instruction offered.*
- *D. Both the California State University and Colleges and the University of California shall have the flexibility to utilize nontraditional criteria for accepting up to 12 1/2% of their lower division students.*
  - *1) to meet the objective specified in Recommendation #24*
  - *2) to conduct controlled experiments designed to identify those students who are most capable of profiting from their instructional programs*
- *E. Each segment shall report annually to the Legislature through the Postsecondary Education Commission on the use of nontraditional admissions criteria.*
- *F. The criteria set forth in this recommendation shall not necessarily be applied to innovative programs*

designed to serve adults beyond the normal age of college attendance.

G. *The segments and/or institutions of higher education may with the approval of the Postsecondary Education Commission alter the eligibility pools established in B, and C, and the flexibility level in D above. The conditions which might justify alteration include:*
   1) *new knowledge based upon controlled experiments, carried out within the segments, which might provide a new basis for targeting students most likely to profit from instruction offered*
   2) *capacities of segments and institutions*
   3) *the needs of a geographic area*
   4) *the programs of a specific institution.*

H. *Admissions policies within the parameters specified in these recommendations need not be applied uniformly within each segment. The criteria are sufficiently flexible to allow for and encourage diversity of student mix within multicampus systems.*

Barriers to College Attendance

Our achievements in extending equal access have not met our promises. Though we have made considerable progress in the 1960's and 1970's, equality of opportunity in postsecondary education is still a goal rather than a reality. Economic and social conditions and early schooling must be significantly improved before equal opportunity can be realized. But there is much that can be done by and through higher education.

National studies indicate that socioeconomic status is more important than intelligence in determining college attendance. A 1968 study of 10,000 high school graduates in the lowest 40% ability distribution showed that if the student had a father of high level occupation, there was a 57% chance he would attend college, if the student had a father of low level occupation, there was a 20% chance he would attend college.[4] Socioeconomic status was found to be particularly important in determining college attendance patterns for women.

In California, persons from low income families are significantly underrepresented in public higher education.

As indicated in Table III, there is a clear correlation between family income and the segment of California higher education a student attends. The average family income for a University of California student is $15,160 (nearly the family income for the average student attending a private institution); for a California State University and Colleges student, $12,330; and a California Community Colleges student, $11,420.

A similar underrepresentation is evident with ethnic minorities. Blacks, Mexican-Americans and Native Americans represent 22.9% of the state's population. However, they comprise only 17.5% of the day enrollment in the California Community Colleges, 11.9% in the California State University and Colleges and 10.6% in the University of California (See Table IV).

> *Recommendation #24.* *Each segment of California public higher education shall strive to approximate by 1980 the general ethnic, sexual and economic composition of the recent California high school graduates.*
>
> *A. This goal shall be achieved by provision of additional student spaces and not by the rejection of any qualified student; the Legislature shall commit the resources necessary to implement this policy.*
>
> *B. The institutions and segments shall consider the following methods for fulfilling this policy:*
>
> *1) affirmative efforts to search out and connect with qualified students*
>
> *2) experimentation to discover alternate means of evaluating student potential*
>
> *3) augmented student financial assistance programs*
>
> *4) improved counseling for disadvantaged students*
>
> *C. Each segment shall prepare a plan for achieving this objective and report annually to the Postsecondary Education Commission on its progress, including specification as to what obstacles stand*

TABLE III

1971 INCOME OF PARENTS OF RESPONDENTS*
GRADUATES AND UNDERGRADUATES - ALL SEGMENTS

WHAT WAS THE APPROX. 1971 INCOME OF YOUR PARENTS OR LEGAL GUARDIAN?	UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA		CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY & COLLEGES		INDEPENDENT COLLEGES		COMMUNITY COLLEGES		TOTAL SAMPLE	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
LESS THAN $3,000	4,011	7.3	4,392	11.1	807	7.4	3,652	12.1	12,862	9.5
$3,000 to $5,999	4,390	8.0	3,911	9.9	761	7.0	3,925	13.1	12,987	9.6
$6,000 to $7,499	3,173	5.8	3,092	7.8	618	5.7	2,979	9.9	9,862	7.3
$7,500 to $8,999	3,315	6.0	3,274	8.3	690	6.3	2,724	9.1	10,003	7.4
$9,000 to $11,999	7,365	13.4	6,949	17.6	1,518	13.9	4,814	16.0	20,646	15.2
$12,000 to $14,999	7,539	13.7	6,065	15.3	1,529	14.0	4,259	14.2	19,392	14.3
$15,000 to $17,999	5,687	10.3	3,760	9.5	1,013	9.3	2,502	8.3	12,962	9.6
$18,000 to $20,999	5,169	9.4	2,868	7.3	993	9.1	1,736	5.8	10,766	7.9
$21,000 to $24,999	4,762	8.6	2,023	5.1	832	7.6	1,380	4.6	8,997	6.6
$25,000 AND ABOVE	9,674	17.6	3,203	8.1	2,148	19.7	2,087	6.9	17,112	12.6

*Source of Data: California State Scholarship and Loan Commission

> *in the way of further implementation. The Commission shall integrate and transmit the reports to the Legislature with evaluations and recommendations.*

Geography also poses barriers. The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education has observed that:

> young people who live in suburban areas are more likely to attend college than those living in inner cities or in nonmetropolitan areas, and that those living in the poverty portions of large metropolitan areas are especially unlikely to attend college.[5]

Access problems also exist in rural areas. A recent study which encompassed thirteen northeastern California counties revealed significant unmet desire and demand for postsecondary education services.[6]

Additionally, there are barriers related to age. Most educational planning, including projections of financial aids needs, is based upon assumptions about a "college age" population, usually between eighteen and the mid-twenties. Such assumptions create impressions among young people that they should be in postsecondary education whether or not they have need and motivation; older persons are led to believe there is no place for them in postsecondary education. Yet the decision about when to attend postsecondary education should be highly individual. Some people may be ready to benefit from postsecondary education at the age of 17, others would be better served at 45. The Department of Labor estimates that before long the average person will be changing careers three times in a lifetime. This suggests a need for retraining at several ages.

There are indications that older students do better in postsecondary education. The most frequently cited example is the World War II GI's. There is no definitive data but some widely held impressions that the same is true of Vietnam and Peace Corps returnees. Yet admissions, financial aids and program development policies continue to focus upon the traditional age group.

> *Recommendation #25.* *A major goal of California for the remainder of the 1970's shall be to insure that considerations*

TABLE IV

Student Enrollment Ethnic Data*

	1970 Percent of California Population	1970 Percent of High School Senior Class	Percent of CCC Day Students	Fall 1972 Percent of CSUC	Fall 1972 Percent of U C
Black	7.0	7.3	8.4	5.3	5.2
Mexican-American	15.5	12.1	7.9	5.5	4.8
Asian-American	2.7	2.5	3.4	4.7	8.3
Native American	.4	.4	1.2	1.1	.6
Other Minority	.4	--	--	4.7	1.8
White	74.0	76.9	77.9	78.7	79.3

*Source of Data: Legislative Analyst with assistance of the California Community Colleges, the California State University and Colleges and the University of California *of quality early schooling, ethnic grouping, family income, geographic location and age no longer impede the access of any citizen who can benefit from higher education.*

Just as there is no optimum age of college attendance, neither is there an optimum pattern. More and more people are needing or wanting to combine formal learning with other activities.

Recommendation #26. Fee structures, admissions policies and financial aids policies and programs shall not discriminate against part-time students and students choosing to combine or alternate education with other experience such as work or travel.

An Invisible Barrier

The ultimate objective of any admissions policy is to enable the student to attend the institution best suited to his or her interests and abilities. Informed student choice plays a crucial role in this process. Sadly, a frequent and almost universal complaint from students throughout California is that information and counseling on postsecondary education are seriously deficient. The heavy workload of high school counselors and the increasing complexity of the college admissions and financial aids processes mitigate against informed student choice.

Another obstacle to informed student choice is institutional competition for students. As enrollments level off and even decline, more aggressive recruiting will become common (Admission policies have already been significantly altered when some campuses have been threatened with a decline in students and a corresponding decline in funding). Competition for students can be healthy if it provides superior educational services and meets legitimate student needs. However, there is danger such competition will escalate into public relations projects designed to fill institutional capacities without regard for the good of the student. The best protection against such excesses is consumer-oriented counseling.

Recommendation #27. *The state shall establish on an experimental basis (piloted for five years) independent postsecondary education counseling centers in several urban and rural areas.*

- *A. These centers shall offer college opportunity information and counseling to any potential applicant.*
- *B. Counseling shall include information on proprietary schools and vocational education opportunities as well as higher education.*
- *C. The centers shall provide continually updated information for high school counselors responsible for college counseling.*
- *D. They shall coordinate recruiting and counseling pools among neighboring institutions to facilitate admission of educationally disadvantaged candidates.*
- *E. Where local needs dictate, information and counseling should be available in other languages as well as English.*
- *F. The Postsecondary Education Commission shall be responsible for administering, staffing and evaluating these programs.*
- *G. Staff shall be employees of the Postsecondary Education Commission.*

The Postsecondary Education Commission shall develop and submit to the Legislature a plan for establishing these centers.

Articulation

Significant numbers of community college students transfer to the four-year institutions. Perhaps it is more significant that greater numbers do not. In any event, students commonly report difficulty in smoothly making the transfer.

TABLE V*

Articulation Data - Fall, 1971

Transfers from California Community Colleges to:

CSUC	32,546	(Total full-time equivalent enrollment 186,366)
UC	6,154	(Total full-time equivalent enrollment 104,248)

*Source of Data: Legislative Analyst

Some students attend a community college initially for personal, financial or geographic reasons. Smooth transfer to four-year institutions is essential for us to have truly equal opportunity in admissions. Especially as we continue to have large increases in community college enrollments, careful attention to articulation processes is critical.

Particular problems include counseling, adequate information, financial aids, recognition of credits, adequate space, and equal treatment.

Recommendation #28. *To facilitate the transfer of qualified students from two-year to four-year colleges and universities:*

- *A. The University of California and California State University and Colleges shall continue to maintain a ceiling of 40% lower division students (we intend this to be a ceiling, not a floor; a campus may fall below 40% or even eliminate the lower division if circumstances justify).*
- *B. Transfer students who were eligible for admission as freshmen to a four-year segment and who have maintained satisfactory academic standing shall continue to be eligible for admission at any undergraduate level to that segment.*
- *C. Each campus within the four-year segments of public higher education shall implement measures to insure that upper division transfer students receive parity in admissions and course enrollments with previously enrolled students.*

D. *The Postsecondary Education Commission shall assume responsibility for coordinating transfer procedures among the public segments of California higher education.*

Evaluation of High School Records

We are concerned about measurements being made too early in life, cutting off a person's chances for higher education. The use of high school records in determining qualification for admission to an institution of higher education should not be inflexible, nor should it penalize a student whose ability develops or is discovered late. We are also concerned that course requirements not be so numerous and specific that they in effect dictate the curriculum of the high schools.

Recommendation #29. *Insofar as the four-year segments use high school achievement as a criterion for freshman admissions:*

A. *The high school records used shall normally begin with the 10th year;*

B. *Methods shall be devised to assess competencies rather than requiring specific high school courses;*

C. *When specific courses are required, no student attending high school on a full-time basis shall be required to devote more than two-thirds of his program to fulfilling course requirements.*

Retention and Attrition

California is a national leader in the proportion and number of high school graduates admitted to some type of postsecondary educational institution. However, California is among the lowest in the country in the proportion of students completing college.[7]

The Newman task force on higher education observed in 1971 that:

> access alone does not lead to a successful education. It means only the exposure of a particular age group to whatever educational institutions there are and not the equality of the experience they are likely to find there. When the Task Force looked behind the

> growth statistics, they were found to mask a major phenomenon: the surprisingly large and growing number of students who voluntarily drop out of college.[8]

It went on to cite a study of the California State University and Colleges which showed that only 13% of entering freshmen graduate in four years from the college they enter. Had they looked at the California Community Colleges, they would have found even more alarming rates of attrition.

Yet we have insufficient information about attrition and its causes. We have found few studies of these students, why they leave higher education institutions, and where or whether they eventually resume their education.

A national study of college dropouts by Alexander W. Astin cited the following as principal predictors of persistence in higher education:[9]

- grades in high school and scores on tests of academic ability
- high degree aspirations at time of college entrance
- financing college education chiefly through and from parents, scholarship or personal savings
- not being employed during the school year
- being male

By this discussion we do not mean to imply that every student should obtain a degree. The higher education experience may assist many students in deciding to pursue other activities. Participation in higher education for even a brief period is often of positive value to both the student and society. Furthermore, there are a number of students who achieve their educational objectives without obtaining a degree, such as those who choose a specific technical or vocational program at community colleges.

The Newman task force has highlighted the social and public policy questions of access and retention:

> we can assume that society fulfills its obligations simply by providing the opportunity for as many as possible to enter college. Success cannot and should not be guaranteed. High dropout rates are not inconsistent with our commitment to broad access, but rather reflect the maintenance of rigorous academic standards and our insistence that a college degree represents real achievement.
>
> Or we can assume that society's obligation (and its own self-interest, as well) is to provide more than just the chance to walk through the college gate--that there must also be access to a useful and personally significant educational experience.[10]

These assumptions are not mutually exclusive. Some dropouts, perhaps, should never have entered college. Yet others might have succeeded if the education available had been tailored to their individual needs. When an institution attempts to hire faculty and develop curriculum relevant to a specific clientele, the result is greater persistence and higher graduation rates for that clientele.

Conclusion

We are concerned with the racial imbalance in public institutions of higher education, especially with the increase as we move from community colleges through the California State University and Colleges to the University of California. Many persons believe the three-tier system with its rigid admissions quotas is inherently racist because socioeconomic and cultural conditions in the early experience of minority persons leave them unable to measure up to the admissions standards of the four-year segments.

For that very reason an open admissions system is often suggested, and was considered by the Joint Committee. Such a policy could open up every public institution in all three segments to any high school graduate or 18-year-old seeking admission.

One argument offered in opposition is that such a policy would dilute the quality of our four-year segments. Another is that, in effect, we already have an open admissions policy since there is a place in higher education for every Californian because of the open door policy of the community colleges.

But another reason has influenced our decision regarding a total open admissions policy. There is little evidence that the four-year institutions are more responsive to the learning needs of these students than are the community colleges.

We are concerned lest the community colleges be seen as convenient places to shepherd the "less qualified" learners, or become places where their aspirations are cooled. Hopefully, every institution of higher education in California will strive always to facilitate each student's learning to the very fullest of his or her potential.

CHAPTER VI

COOPERATION BETWEEN INSTITUTIONS

The preceding chapters and recommendations specified steps California must take to develop coordinated systems of postsecondary education capable of offering comprehensive educational services. Coordination and planning at the state and system-office levels are critical. However, these efforts will be insufficient unless similar steps are taken at the institutional and regional levels.

The two four-year segments have statewide missions and in some instances serve a statewide clientele. But this does not preclude local responsibility. The location of a college or university has a significant impact upon the surrounding geographic community. Institutions of higher education have a responsibility to be aware of the educational needs of their local communities and to be responsive to those needs.

The potential for enhancing educational and economic effectiveness through cooperation within segments, and between institutions in different segments, has not been aggressively explored in California. The little cooperation which does occur is predominantly intrasegmental. There are some indications of renewed interest in interinstitutional cooperation on the part of some California colleges and universities. Yet there is still an overriding emphasis upon institutional interests and objectives, rather than upon the interests of the students, communities and regions which the institutions are expected to serve.

The traditional concept of a campus as an academically self-sufficient unit able or striving to meet all the needs of its students and faculty seems little disturbed by the changes that have occurred in the surrounding social environment.

A study team commissioned by the Joint Committee found few examples of cooperation between the state's three systems of public higher education or between public and private institutions.[1] The segmental structure in California has often encouraged intrasegmental cooperation at the cost of creating greater obstacles to cooperation across segmental lines. The San Francisco Consortium is the only multipurpose cooperative arrangement involving institutions from each of the three public systems.

The study team concluded that the failure to form cooperative alliances across segmental lines is due to lack of interest within, and lack of inducements from without. It also found that:

- More cooperation is necessary because nontraditional forms of education require new organizational forms and because there is not going to be enough money to enable each institution to do everything it wants to do on its own.

- The smaller private colleges and the community colleges appear to be more sensitive to the need for cooperation.

- Cooperation within segments is important. However, it does not obviate the need for cooperation among different kinds of institutions. Each institution should be able to pursue its own strengths without the necessity of duplicating programs and services that may be better performed by another institution.

- There are only two examples of systematic faculty exchange agreements involving more than a few individuals. These arrangements are between institutions in the private sector.

- Student exchange arrangements or formal agreements for cross-registration or concurrent enrollment are much more common than faculty sharing. This does not mean, however, that large numbers of students are permitted to enroll at a second institution. The evidence is that most exchange agreements involve only a relatively few students.

- Formal student exchange agreements occur most frequently at the community college level. Several private institutions have small exchange programs in areas in which at least one of the participants has a very strong program. Among the larger colleges and universities, there seems to be a common belief that their students have no needs which these campuses cannot satisfy themselves.

- There appears to be very little cooperative use of plant and equipment among California's public and private institutions of higher education.

If planning is to be truly comprehensive, it must have a regional component. For each region of the state there should be a determination of the total demand for postsecondary education and of the availability of resources to meet that demand. Beyond planning, procedures should be developed in each region and across the state for sharing of facilities and faculty and for cross-registration of students. As educators and lay citizens come together to plan and cooperate, other avenues for interinstitutional cooperation will become apparent for California.

Interinstitutional cooperation recognizes and builds on institutional diversity. Different institutions do different things well; few institutions are able to offer an exhaustive range of educational services. Through interinstitutional cooperation the student in one institution can have access to the resources of other institutions and segments.

Exploration and development of interinstitutional cooperation will require commitment on the part of the state, the Postsecondary Education Commission and the higher education community. The establishment of regional councils is an essential first step. Each council should include community representatives as well as representatives of each institution within the region. The initial effort of these councils should be in the area of comprehensive planning.

If such councils are created and receive strong support from the Legislature, Governor, Postsecondary Education Commission, and public and private educational institutions, California can increase its capacity to offer and enhance postsecondary education.

Some persons fear that the efforts to accelerate development of cooperative activities would jeopardize current voluntary efforts of a less ambitious nature within each segment. But the two are not mutually exclusive. Opportunities for interinstitutional cooperation will be severely limited as long as the initiative must come from the segments rather than from the individual campuses and the proposed regional councils.

> *Recommendation #30.* *The Postsecondary Education Commission shall prepare and transmit to the Legislature a plan for establishing regional councils throughout the state; each council shall be composed of community representatives and representatives of each institution within the region.*
>
> *The regional councils shall promote interinstitutional cooperation and comprehensive regional planning. Specific functions shall include:*
>
> A. *Surveying total demand, present and projected, for postsecondary education in each region;*
> B. *Surveying availability of public and private resources to meet demands for postsecondary education;*
> C. *Finding methods for effectively utilizing or increasing educational resources;*
> D. *Encouraging the development of policies and procedures for the cross-registration of students and sharing of faculty and facilities.*
>
> *Recommendation #31.* *Regional planning shall have high priority in the use of federal grants for comprehensive statewide planning.*

CHAPTER VII

NEW DIRECTIONS

The basic delivery system of higher education was developed in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries and has remained basically unchanged since. This system assumes that a college or university is a physical location where students and teachers assemble, and that a college education consists of four years of courses. This assumption of space and time has, as one writer puts it, "obscured a vision of the future that may not only be more plausible, but also more desirable."[1]

Technological changes, the necessity for providing postsecondary education to persons who cannot come to the campus as full-time students, and a new skepticism about the use of credit hours and degrees as indicators of learning are forcing a reevaluation of campus-oriented traditional higher education.

Until recently, expanding access to higher education meant allowing greater numbers of persons in the 18 to 24-year-old age group to attend a college or university. In the future, postsecondary education will be less campus-bound and will serve persons in all age groups. Many individuals have neither the time nor resources to attend a conventional college or university. Yet their needs for postsecondary education are often at least as great as the needs of those who attend conventional colleges and universities.

Some potential students, who might be served by alternative delivery systems and off-campus learning include:

- those who cannot afford the time or cost of conventional higher education
- those whose ethnic background has constrained them from full participation in the educational establishment
- those whose secondary preparation has been inadequate
- those with interests and talents not served by traditional education

- those whose educational progress has been interrupted by illness, military service or other temporary conditions

- those who have failed to take advantage of educational opportunity and come to regret it

- those who have become technologically unemployed and must retool themselves in mid-career

- those who are elderly and found no educational opportunities present at an earlier age

- those who are in prisons or hospitals or confined by illness in their homes

- those who are increasingly bored with the routine of a highly technological society or faced with increased leisure time

- those who must move frequently in order to accompany spouses or pursue careers.

The results of a recent national survey of adult learning needs (see Table VI) revealed a great unmet demand for adult education but little enthusiasm for attending traditional colleges and universities. Caution is advisable in applying results of a national study to a single state. But limited market surveys undertaken by the University of California and the California State University and Colleges, and a recent study of educational needs in northeastern California, tend to confirm existence in California of a large unmet need for postsecondary education. We are concerned about meeting that need.

Certification

There are many ways of acquiring knowledge and competencies besides attending college. It is wasteful of time and resources of individuals and the state to insist that persons who have acquired knowledge outside the classroom return to college to accumulate academic credit hours for a degree. In addition, some persons are highly mobile and never have the opportunity to remain in one

TABLE VI

WHAT ADULTS WOULD LIKE TO STUDY

	Total Choices	First Choice
Vocational subjects (architecture, business skills, commercial art, computer science, cosmetology, education and teacher training, engineering, industrial trades, journalism, law, management skills, medicine and dentistry, nursing, salesmanship, technical skills)	78.2%	43.0%
Hobbies and recreation (crafts, fine and visual arts, flight training, performing arts, safety, sports and games, travel and living in foreign countries)	62.8%	13.4%
Home and family life (child development, gardening and flower arranging, home repairs, sewing and cooking)	56.0%	12.0%
Personal development (investment, occult sciences, personal psychology, physical fitness and self-development, public speaking)	54.3%	6.8%
General education (basic education, biological sciences, creative writing, English-language training, great books, humanities, languages, physical sciences, social sciences)	47.9%	12.6%
Public affairs (citizenship, community problems and organizations, consumer education, environmental studies, public affairs)	36.3%	4.5%
Religious studies	15.4%	3.0%
Agriculture and farming	10.9%	2.9%

WHERE ADULTS CHOOSE TO STUDY

	Would-be Learners	Learners
Public high school (day or evening)	15.8%	9.1%
Community-run "free school"	10.4%	2.6%
Public two-year college or technical school	9.8%	5.9%
Home	9.6%	16.9%
Four-year college or university	8.5%	5.5%
Private trade or business school	7.6%	2.9%
Business or industrial site	4.9%	5.3%
Individual instructor	4.7%	4.4%
Employer	4.6%	13.1%
Correspondence school	3.6%	2.4%
Community or social organization	3.2%	6.1%
Fine arts, performing arts, or crafts studio	2.8%	0.2%
Graduate school	2.6%	2.4%
Religious institution or group	1.9%	6.3%
Government agency (federal, state, local)	1.6%	5.5%
Recreational or sports group	1.2%	2.1%
Library or other cultural institution	1.1%	2.2%
Other site	1.3%	1.6%

MAIN OBSTACLES TO ADULTS' LEARNING

Cost, including tuition and all incidentals	53.0%
Not enough time	46.2%
Don't want to go to school full-time	35.1%
Home responsibilities	32.1%
Job responsibilities	28.4%
Amount of time required to complete program	20.8%
Afraid that I'm too old to begin	17.2%
No information about where I can get what I want	16.5%
Courses I want aren't scheduled when I can attend	15.7%
Strict attendance requirements	14.9%

NOTE: Would-be learners are individuals who would like to study in the coming year; learners are those who have studied within the past year. Data compiled in summer of 1972.

SOURCE: COMMISSION ON NON-TRADITIONAL STUDY institution long enough to fulfill residency requirements for degrees. There should be an agency which can evaluate their extramural learning, including work experience, and award a degree when the requisite knowledge is attained.

Conventional colleges and universities nearly monopolize the certification and credentialing functions in our society. We believe these functions have been overemphasized by society and by instituitions of higher education. There should be alternative means of attaining credentials, certificates and degrees for persons who acquire the necessary competencies but are unable or unwilling to participate in conventional postsecondary education. The availability of alternative routes to certification would allow qualified persons to advance educationally, occupationally and professionally. It would release "captive audiences" (those whose only interest is in acquiring a passport to employment) from colleges and universities. And it would free institutions of education from domination by credentialing functions to concentrate on learning. Learning, not credentialing, is the primary purpose of higher education.

Off-Campus Learning

In the foreseeable future, conventional campuses will continue to play a most important role in providing higher education. However, they must be complemented by new approaches.

We are particularly concerned with the development of off-campus programs which attempt to bring postsecondary education to the student. If properly developed, these can enhance access and choice for the people of California.

Some of the characteristics of these extended forms of higher education include new student clientele, new instructional techniques, new uses of media, off-campus settings, credit by examination, and credit for work and other nonacademic experiences. Many of these techniques have been in existence for a long time but their magnitude and importance is increasing. Several approaches utilize outcomes evaluation of learning, shifting the emphasis from hours spent in a classroom and study to educational achievements.

At the present time in California many public and private colleges and universities are developing programs for delivering education to the learner wherever he or she may be. In the public sector, several community colleges have long offered off-campus educational services to persons unable to attend college for reasons of age, geographical location, or other commitments. The California State University and Colleges has recently established a Commission on External Degrees. The University of California is developing its Extended University.

Several major policy issues are raised by these conditions and developments. Should California commit itself to off-campus learning? If so, how should programs be developed? Should each segment establish and pursue an independent course of action? Would an integrated state approach be more effective?

A New Segment

We believe California should commit itself to extended learning where there is a need and clientele for this type of educational service. We have concluded that a statewide integrated effort is likely to be more effective than a fragmented effort with each segment defining its own goals and interests. We propose that a fourth public segment, the California Cooperative University, be established in California. It should have the primary responsibility for planning and coordinating off-campus programs and should be authorized to offer its own programs and award credits and degrees.

The first mission of the new segment would be to develop and submit a state plan for off-campus postsecondary education to the Postsecondary Education Commission and the Legislature and Governor. The Cooperative University is to coordinate the efforts of the segments in extended learning and to provide programs under its own auspices when there are needs the segments are not meeting. It is to work with the regional councils (proposed in Chapter VI) in assessing need for off-campus postsecondary education and resources available to meet the needs.

The Cooperative University should also develop methods of recognizing achievement on the basis of experiential learning and equivalency tests. One function should be to establish and maintain a "credit bank." Those persons who accumulate credits from several sources (conventional academic work, work experience and tests) can have records of their achievement evaluated and maintained, and can be awarded degrees when appropriate. Finally, the new segment, in conjunction with the existing segments, is to develop and implement alternative delivery systems. These should include individualized and independent study through television and computer-based instruction.

> *Recommendation #32.* *The state shall establish a fourth segment of California public postsecondary education.*
>
> A. *Responsibilities shall include:*
>   1) *developing and submitting to the Postsecondary Education Commission and the Legislature a state plan for extended forms of higher education. The purpose of such a plan is to: coordinate the segmental efforts, statewide and regionally; provide for development of new programs when there are needs unmet by the other statewide segments; and establish policies and procedures in such areas as funding, admissions and financial aids;*
>   2) *awarding credits on the basis of experiential learning and equivalency tests;*
>   3) *maintaining a credit bank for persons who accumulate academic credit through several channels: postsecondary institutions, work experience, tests;*
>   4) *awarding degrees and certificates;*
>   5) *developing and implementing alternative delivery systems including individualized and independent study.*
>
> B. *This segment shall consist of a minimum of administrative staff and faculty but shall have no campuses.*
>
> C. *The Legislature, through the Postsecondary Education Commission or a joint committee, in either case with the assistance of a citizens' advisory committee, shall develop a plan for the establishment of this segment, including governance mechanisms and representation on the Postsecondary Education Commission.*

The concept of a fourth segment will not be popular with many leaders in the California higher education community. Many of these persons sincerely believe that any new educational programs should be developed exclusively through existing institutions. Some see themselves as the guardians of academic standards and fear an erosion if some aspects of higher education are outside their jurisdiction. Others fear that competition from another segment will have an adverse impact upon their institutions. Still others envision external programs as a method of maintaining institutional growth at a time when the normal "college age" population is increasing very slowly.

We have carefully considered each of these positions. There are dangers in any new undertaking, but there are greater risks in failing to take the initiatives dictated by societal and educational needs.

Several considerations prompt our decision to create a fourth public segment.

First, we find ourselves lagging behind other states in moving towards making off-campus educational services available to our citizens.

Next, the expertise of the staffs, and, particularly of the faculties of the University of California and the California State University and Colleges is in the area of conventional classroom education. In an extensive survey, we found little interest on the part of faculties in external programs.[2] Yet, as we have watched the development of external programs within the segments, we have seen the faculties establish virtual control over the programs. We agree that high standards should be maintained and protected, but there is an unhealthy tendency on the part of the faculties to equate high standards with conventional approaches. We believe faculty as individuals should be encouraged to participate in external programs of their own institutions and of the fourth segment. However, we do not believe the collective faculty should have an effective veto over the development of these programs. We see little possibility for curricular innovation and new approaches to learning keyed to new clientele as long as courses and programs must be channeled through conventional departments and academic senates. There should be quality controls for all extended learning programs. However, quality does not mean giving the most power to those with the least commitment to the programs.

Third, it seems likely that external programs, if left fragmented, will be more responsive to institutional interests than to the educational needs of the people of California. We have observed little evidence of joint planning or cooperation on the part of those responsible for the University of California and California State University and Colleges programs. Though there is some sharing of data, coordination is almost nonexistent. Coordination should begin while the programs are in their early development, not after their directions are largely determined. Development of autonomous external programs will only add to problems of coordination and planning.

Finally, the segmental organization of California higher education seems inappropriate to many of the new approaches. Constraints such as the separation of lower and upper division are not likely to facilitate nontraditional learning.

"The College of California"

A report prepared for the Joint Committee recommended that California establish a new educational institution designed and staffed by nonacademic professional leaders for comprehensive adult education.[3] The concept of involving practitioners of various professions in the educational process has merit.

> *Recommendation #33.* *The Postsecondary Education Commission shall study the proposal for an institution operated by nonacademic professionals and report to the Legislature on the need, feasibility and costs.*

If it is determined that the proposal for a "College of California" should be implemented, the concept should be incorporated into the Cooperative University.

Institutionalizing Innovation

Second only to the need to institutionalize diversity is the need to institutionalize innovation. Through carefully controlled experimentation we can discover more about the learning process, about how to serve new and diverse clientele and how to improve cost effectiveness and productivity. The development of this new knowledge is essential to the continuing vitality of California higher education. It will require commitment of resources, imagination and energy on the part of the state and our institutions of higher education.

We endorse the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education's recent recommendation that each college and university annually reallocate 1 to 3% of existing resources for new endeavors.[4]

> *Recommendation #34.* *Each public institution of higher education in the state should redeploy a significant percentage of its annual operating budget for the purposes of supporting innovative programs.*

Commitment to self-renewal should exist at every level--state, segmental, institutional, departmental, etc. The state should establish a continuing fund for the support of innovation in postsecondary education. The fund should be administered by the Postsecondary Education Commission with the assistance of an advisory committee to review proposals.

> *Recommendation #35.* *The Legislature shall establish a fund to support innovation in postsecondary education.*
>
> A. *The fund shall be supported at the level of 3% of the annual state operating budget for postsecondary education.*
> B. *It shall be utilized to support: innovative proposals for providing educational services to new clientele; new curriculum and pedagogy; greater cost effectiveness and productivity.*
> C. *Individuals or institutions in nonprofit postsecondary education shall be eligible for grants.*
> D. *A minimum of 10% of each grant shall be used for evaluation and dissemination of results.*
> E. *Absent special justification, no project shall be supported by this fund for more than three years.*
> F. *The Postsecondary Education Commission shall develop and submit to the Legislature a plan for administering the innovation fund.*

Funds should be awarded on a contractual basis upon acceptance of proposals. Individuals or institutions in public or private nonprofit postsecondary education should be eligible to apply. A healthy competition for experimentation funds is desirable.

After evaluation, successful projects should be integrated into institutional and segmental budgets; others should be dropped. An advantage of a state-sponsored innovation fund is that results can more easily be made available to all institutions of higher education in California.

CHAPTER VIII

INDEPENDENT HIGHER EDUCATION

Independent or private nonprofit institutions provide significant higher education to Californians--both quantitatively and qualitatively. They constitute a major resource and play an integral part in California's total higher education effort.

These institutions number approximately seventy, about fifty of which collectively form the Association of Independent California Colleges and Universities (AICCU). In 1971-72, AICCU institutions enrolled more than 118,000 full- and part-time students (a larger number than attends the University of California), the equivalent of over 98,000 full-time students. They granted more than 24,000 degrees in 1970-71.[1] Generally they are characterized by the following:

- independence of control and governing authority
- more diverse sources of financial support
- lack of governmental bureaucracy
- freedom to innovate and to meet students' needs
- diversity of missions, size, functions and educational programs
- freedom to be more directly concerned about personal, ethical and moral values
- high student charges

The value of these institutions lies both in their response to the educational needs and wants of many Californians, and in the diversity they add to California's total system of higher education. They offer unique opportunities for innovation and experimentation in higher education. Also, they divert large numbers of students who would theoretically otherwise enroll in public institutions at a direct cost to taxpayers.

At this point in time, California's independent colleges and universities are increasingly concerned about their own survival and viability--a concern shared by the Joint Committee. The overall growth rate of student enrollments has slowed and is projected to level or decline in the 1980's. This combines with economic factors to pose a serious concern about the future of these institutions.

For whatever reasons (and recognizing a national trend in the same direction), California's independent institutions experienced an 8.5% decline in freshman applications and a 5.2% decline in transfer applications from April of 1971 to April of 1972. Twelve institutions experienced a decrease in the number of full-time undergraduate students during that period.[2]

The major reason is probably the dramatically widened "tuition gap"--the difference between what it costs a student to attend an independent institution and a public institution. California maintains a mixed no- and low-tuition policy at public institutions while inflation and other rising costs have greatly increased tuition at the independent institutions. So the tuition gap has widened by $1332 during the last 16 years. In 1956, it was $546. In 1972, it was $1878. In the Fall of 1973, it is likely to be $2000.[3]

In addition to the widening tuition gap and the decline in applications, many of the private colleges have suffered budgetary crises in recent years. In 1968-69, these institutions had a combined surplus of $2.5 million. In 1970-71, there was a combined deficit of $6 million, although the number of institutions with operating deficits had decreased from 26 to 23.[4]

So the policy question is whether or not California has a responsibility to assure the survival, quality and vitality of these institutions. And, if the answer is yes, how does the state do so without interfering with institutional independence and autonomy? If, in fact, state financial assistance is necessary for their very survival, the matter of assuring quality becomes critical. The state government has a responsibility to assure that taxpayers' money is spent for quality education. (We do not imply, however, that the quality of independent institutions is generally questioned.)

California's constitution specifically prohibits the appropriation of public money for the support of any sectarian or denominational school, or any school not under the exclusive control of the officers of the public schools. While the Constitution Revision Commission, in 1970, recommended a change to allow direct assistance to nonsectarian private institutions, there has been little progress towards legislative implementation.

The conflicting values of state responsibility and institutional autonomy are probably best reconciled with the continuation and expansion of current programs which channel funds through students rather than directly to institutions. The Joint Committee has concluded that this approach has educational and economic merit. Channeling aid through the consumer also increases student options.

California operates a state scholarship program which permits recipients to use their award at any accredited public or private institution of higher education in the state. In 1971-72, nearly 47% of the scholarships, representing almost 80 percent of state scholarship dollars, were used at independent colleges and universities. According to the 1973-74 Governor's Budget, the average cost of a state scholarship for a student at an independent college is less than the average cost to the state (including capital outlay) of educating a scholarship student at the University of California.[5]

The Legislature has authorized state scholarships for 3.5 percent of high school graduates. Expansion of this and other programs, as proposed in Chapter IX, would maximize student choice and further aid higher education's independent sector.

If the levels of student aid we have proposed do not meet the financial problems of the independent institutions, then the Legislature and the Postsecondary Education Commission should explore and evaluate the emerging tuition-equalization proposals. Again, aid should be provided to students, not directly to institutions.

Since independent colleges and universities are such a vital element in California's educational capability, it is important that there be cooperation between independent and public institutions at state and regional levels. The Postsecondary Education Commission and the regional councils proposed in Chapter VI should include representation of these institutions and consideration of their needs, though in such a manner as not to jeopardize their independence and autonomy.

As a practical and economic matter, the state should periodically determine whether private institutions are being fully utilized and, if not, what state policies could encourage greater use of capacities and resources. Accordingly, the Postsecondary Education Commission should keep the Governor and Legislature advised about the welfare of independent higher education.*

---

*See Recommendation #17 P

Recommendation #36. California's independent colleges and universities shall have representation on the Postsecondary Education Commission.*

Recommendation #37. The Legislature shall urge California's independent institutions to participate (voluntarily) in the state programs for interinstitutional cooperation and regional consortia.

Recommendation #38. The Legislature shall expand existing student financial assistance programs which allow the student to utilize his aid at independent institutions.**

Recommendation #39. Any additional financial aid to independent institutions shall be channeled through the student.

Recommendation #40. The Postsecondary Education Commission shall annually report, with recommendations, to the Legislature and Governor regarding the financial conditions of independent institutions, their enrollment and application figures, the number of student spaces available and the respective cost of utilizing those spaces versus providing additional public spaces.

---

*See Recommendation #18

**See Recommendation #43

CHAPTER IX

FINANCING

The major issues of financing California postsecondary education include finding ways to:

- maintain a level of support which assures high quality and equal access
- develop budgeting and funding policies which will enhance flexibility, diversity and responsiveness to changing needs for educational services
- price higher education in a manner which will optimize access
- meet the needs for student financial assistance
- economize and increase productivity in a manner consistent with educational quality
- insure the survival of independent higher education

California currently spends more on higher education than any other state. In 1972-73, state support was about $967 million with local sources adding another $362 million. The state's share represented 13.1% of general fund revenues. In 1970-71, the latest year for which figures are available, California ranked nineteenth among the states in combined state and local appropriations for higher education per full-time equivalent student, and ninth in combined state and local appropriations for higher education per $1000 of per capita personal income.

Over the past decade California has gradually increased the portion of public revenues devoted to postsecondary education though not at the rate of inflation and enrollment increases (see Table VII). This has contributed to a "cost-revenue squeeze" characterized by increased expenditures for personal services and equipment exceeding the general rate of inflation without a corresponding increase in available revenues. The situation was accentuated by the difficulties of offsetting higher costs with greater productivity, competing social and political priorities, public disenchantment, economic recession, and statutory formulas for other state programs which left higher education with whatever remained in the general fund.

We do not believe higher education should be used as the "balancing" factor in state budgets. The improved outlook for the economy and state revenues makes this unlikely in the future. Additionally, public confidence may be slowly restored and serious attempts at greater productivity may bring economies. However, the days of money on demand are past. The efficient allocation and utilization of limited resources will be a continuing problem for higher education in the years ahead.

Uncertainties

At no time in the recent history of postsecondary education have so many uncertainties surrounded the issues of financing. Major questions beyond the purview of the Legislature will ultimately be decided by the courts and the federal government, including:

- What is the legality of charging nonresident tuition to persons who have declared residency in California?
- Will family income remain the basis for determining student financial aid to recently emancipated 18-year-olds?
- Will the Serrano and related decisions requiring equalization of public funding, be held applicable to community colleges?
- Will the federal government fund Basic Opportunity Grants to provide a grant up to $1400 to any student attending postsecondary education?*
- What will be the conclusions and impact of the National Commission on the Financing of Postsecondary Education established by Congress in the Education Amendments of 1972?

With so many significant uncertainties, we have decided to propose no fundamental alterations in pricing or budgeting at this time.

---

*Implications are analyzed in our consultant report titled Financing Postsecondary Education in California.

TABLE VII

STATE BUDGET EXPENDITURES FOR HIGHER EDUCATION*

(Millions of dollars)

	Total State Budget Expenditures	Expended for U of Calif.		Expended for State U & C		Expended for C.C.'s		Total Public Segment (1)	
		Amount	% of Total	Amount	% of Total	Amount	% of Total	Amount	% of Total
1966 - 67	4,145	243	5.9%	168	4.1%	71	1.7%	482 (643)	11.6%
1967 - 68	4,670	247	5.3%	197	4.2%	82	1.8%	526 (694)	11.3%
1968 - 69	5,267	291	5.5%	237	4.5%	105	2.0%	633 (847)	12.0%
1969 - 70	6,073	330	5.4%	288	4.7%	127	2.1%	745 (995)	12.3%
1970 - 71	6,213	337	5.4%	305	4.9%	163	2.6%	805 (1093)	13.0%
1971 - 72	6,471	337	5.2%	305	4.7%	184	2.8%	826 (1168)	12.8%
1972 - 73	7,240	336	4.6%	350	4.8%	222	3.1%	908 (1274)	12.5%

(1) The amounts in parenthesis are totals of state and local funds.

* Source of data: Budget reports of Legislative Analyst

We did, however, examine various policy options. We were impressed with the concept of "portability"--in effect, funding students directly and letting them take their educational subsidy to the institution of their choice. This approach was adopted by Congress in the Education Amendments of 1972. A system of portable grants suggests a revised pricing policy. Together these approaches to pricing and budgeting deserve serious evaluation by California when some of the major questions surrounding higher education finance are clarified.

Tuition

The authority to levy student charges for instruction and instructional facilities in public postsecondary education should reside in one agency. When an individual segment can levy charges independently without regard to the impact on other segments and state student financial aid programs, the prospects for rational state planning and coordination are considerably diminished. The levels of student charges are matters of public policy and forms of taxation. Hence, powers to levy tuition should reside with elected representatives of the people.

> *Recommendation #41. The Legislature shall determine whether or not students in public postsecondary education shall be charged for instruction and instructional facilities and the amount of any such charges.*

If student charges are levied, they should not be utilized for financing the construction of physical facilities for instructional purposes. The state should provide the necessary instructional physical facilities for the University of California and the California State University and Colleges.

Funds for construction of instructional facilities should be obtained by legislative appropriation, state bonding approved by the voters, or private donation. Students should not be taxed to pay for such facilities in lieu of funding by the people or their elected representatives.

Recommendation #42. If charges are levied for instructional purposes, funds derived shall not be used to finance construction of physical facilities for instructional purposes. Student financial aids shall have the first priority in the use of such funds.

Student Aid

The Master Plan Survey Team did not give adequate attention to financial assistance. As a result, most of the current programs were developed on an ad hoc and piecemeal basis during the 1960's. We believe it is time to rationalize these programs and their interrelationships.

Two basic and complementary approaches are currently embodied in California's programs of financial aid. The first is providing aid to economically disadvantaged students of demonstrated high potential. This is the objective of state scholarships and college opportunity grants. The second approach provides aid to students who are both economically and educationally disadvantaged and have potential to benefit from higher education. Most educational opportunity programs serve this purpose. Both types of student aid have merit and both have been remarkably successful in making higher education possible for many students.

The recent Student Resources Survey conducted by the State Scholarship and Loan Commission revealed a significant gap between available student financial aid and legitimate need for assistance. This study concluded that, "In all segments students with financial need were denied aid because the institution had insufficient funds to assist them."[1] Because only persons already participating in higher education were surveyed we do not know how many may be completely excluded for economic reasons. In addition, we know that California ranks among the lowest of the large states in providing student assistance. There is clearly a need for more aid.

California's existing framework of financial aid programs can probably meet student assistance needs. However, each aid program must be expanded, the allocations must be put on a rational and consistent basis, and administration must be improved to insure that assistance goes to the students whose needs are greatest.

California State Scholarships are awarded to academically able students who need financial assistance to meet their tuition and fee costs. They may be used in any accredited institution of higher education. The maximum grant is $2250. The number of new state scholarships should be increased from the annual 3.5% of high school graduates to 5%. This increase should be phased in by an increase of .5% annually until 5% is reached. In addition to assisting more needy students of high achievement, raising the number of state scholarship awards will help insure the survival of independent higher education.

The College Opportunity Grant Program (COG) assists students from low income families, largely from minority groups, whose high school records demonstrate high potential for additional education. Grants may be used for subsistence as well as direct costs of education. This program has been highly successful and should also be expanded. Presently, it has no established allocation rationale. We recommend that a base be provided at an annual rate of 1% of high school graduates. This would increase new grants by 50% over the current base of 2000 per year.

Educational opportunity programs (EOP) have succeeded in allowing many students of low income and poor quality precollege education, but with potential and motivation, to participate in California higher education. These programs also lack a rational allocation base and are more subject to the vicissitudes of the annual budget than state scholarships or college opportunity grants. In addition, there is need to insure that these programs are administered flexibly and that they go to the most needy students each year.

We propose that EOP be funded at the rate of 5% of the University of California and California State University and Colleges full-time equivalent student enrollment and 5% of the average daily attendance of the California Community Colleges, excluding adult education. The funding level should average $500 per award. The E.O.P. funding for U.C. should be in addition to and conditional upon the Regents maintaining their current level of support. The funds should be appropriated to the State Scholarship and Loan Commission for allocation. Each public college and university would then be allocated EOP funds upon the Commission's determination of greatest need. However, no institution's program should be funded at a rate less than 2% of full-time students.

This approach to EOP would provide rationality and stability, and would allow for improved planning and administration. It would improve the capacity of the state to identify the greatest needs and channel funds to meet them.

The Occupational Education and Training Grant Program enables talented and financially needy students to commence and finish a postsecondary vocational program. This program has merit based upon its objectives. Like EOP and COG it has no specified allocation base. Five hundred awards at an average level of $1000 are authorized for the initial year. We believe the program should be funded on a basis of .5% of high school graduates annually. This would increase the number of yearly grants to 1500.

The Graduate Fellowship Program assists students in professional or graduate studies. Its purpose is to permit able and financially needy students to pursue advanced work. Like state scholarships and the COGs, Graduate Fellowships can be used at any accredited institution of higher education. Thus, they assist California's independent colleges by increasing the number of students able to attend. Although this program is authorized to be funded as high as 2 percent of the AB degrees granted in California in the previous academic year, it has never been fully funded. We propose full funding. We also believe recipients of graduate fellowships should be limited to four renewals. There is presently no limit on renewals.

Finally, the law should specify the state's commitment to each of the programs and its intent to fund them jointly. This will assure California of a comprehensive approach to student financial aids and guarantee the availability of both legitimate types of financial assistance - aid to those of demonstrated high potential who are economically needy and aid to those who are educationally and economically disadvantaged.

In the event that additional financial aid programs are required, we believe consideration should be given to establishment of a state-funded work-study program. This type of financial aid has been highly effective in California and other states.

Recommendation #43. *The Legislature shall create and operate a comprehensive interrelated program of state*

TABLE VIII

ESTIMATED IMPACT OF FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE PROPOSALS*

	Funding at level of 1973-74 Budget Act		Joint Committee Proposal 1974-75		Joint Committee Proposal 1976-77 [1]	
	Students	Funds [2]	Students	Funds [2]	Students	Funds [2]
State Scholarship	27,819	$28.1	29,500	$29.8	40,000	$40.1 [3]
COG	4,825	6.4	6,000	7.6	8,500	10.7 [3]
EOP	33,400	9.4	41,200	20.6	45,800	22.9 [4]
Graduate Fellowship	600	1.1	1,500	2.5	1,600	2.7
Occupational Education	500	.5	1,600	1.6	2,400	2.4 [3]
	67,144	$45.5	79,800	$62.1	98,300	$78.8

[1] Assumes 1973-74 constant dollar value (i.e., no increase in average award levels).
[2] In millions of dollars.
[3] Assumes 325,000 high school graduates.
[4] Assumes full-time enrollment of 916,000 and average grant award of $500.

* Source of Data: Legislative Analyst

financial assistance. It shall appropriate supportive funds to the State Scholarship and Loan Commission on the following allocation basis:

- *A. The State Scholarship Program at a level of 5% of high school graduates. This program shall be increased at an annual rate of .5% until the 5% level is achieved.*
- *B. The College Opportunity Grant Program at a level of 1% of high school graduates.*
- *C. The Educational Opportunity Program at a level of 5% of full-time equivalent enrollment or average daily attendance excluding adult education at an average of at least $500.00 per award. The Commission shall allocate the EOP money to campuses on the basis of need, except that no institution shall receive a level of support less than 2% of full-time students.*
- *D. The Occupational Education and Training Grant Program at a level of .5% of high school graduates.*
- *E. The Graduate Fellowship Program at the currently authorized level of 2% of A.B. degrees; recipients shall be limited to four renewals.*

The levels and amounts of the awards of the various programs shall be reviewed annually by the Scholarship and Loan Commission which shall recommend such adjustments as it finds necessary to the Governor and Legislature.

Recommendation #44. *The California State Scholarship and Loan Commission shall report to the Legislature on the need for and methods of implementing a state work-study program to provide financial assistance to students in public postsecondary education.*

Productivity and Efficiency

Despite numerous societal, technological and educational changes over the past four decades, higher education has only slightly altered its basic design. In California, there has recently emerged on the part of some colleges and universities a new interest in experimenting to achieve increased productivity and efficiency while maintaining or improving educational quality. Many of the approaches being developed can break the academic "lock-step" while individualizing education for students and freeing faculty time for advising and consulting with students.

> *Recommendation #45**. The following proposals for increasing educational productivity and costs effectiveness should be considered carefully by each institution of higher education:*
>
> A. *acceleration of certificate and degree programs where consistent with educational quality;*
> B. *creating new graduate programs only under exceptional circumstances of student demand and societal need;*
> C. *greater use of advanced placement and challenge examinations;*
> D. *interinstitutional and intersegmental cooperation, including sharing of facilities and faculty and concurrent enrollment of students;*
> E. *continued review by the public segments of the feasibility of cooperative arrangements as a major criterion in the capital review process;*
> F. *greater use of technology, particularly tapes, television and other media which are conducive to student self-paced learning and educational flexibility;*
> G. *development of methods to encourage cost effectiveness at all levels including incentives such as additional funds for innovation from savings achieved;*
> H. *improvement of management techniques and information systems, including the development of capacity to compare costs and results of comparable programs;*
> I. *development of an outcomes approach to budgeting for postsecondary education;*
> J. *utilization of all available academic and nonacademic facilities on and off campus;*
> K. *continued efforts to maximize facility utilization including evenings and weekends;*
> L. *provision of adequate support services to faculty to insure that their time and energies are freed for teaching and/or research;*
> M. *improvement of the transfer processes to insure removal of unreasonable barriers, particularly between*

two-year and four-year institutions and to avoid repetition of courses covering similar material;

N. *improved programmatic articulation with high schools to avoid unnecessary repetition of subject matter;*

O. *continuing review of the feasibility of year-round operation;*

P. *early admission of advanced high school students;*

Q. *careful and vigorous monitoring of the growth of administrative staffs, particularly in the segmental central offices.*

Faculty Compensation

We believe that effective teaching and effective research should be equally valued. Therefore, insofar as possible, persons who perform those functions in California higher education should be equally compensated.

> *Recommendation #46.* *The Postsecondary Education Commission shall study and report to the Legislature on discrepancies in faculty compensation for teaching and research, including measures that the Legislature may take to assure equity in compensation for these functions.*

Community College Finances

The 1960 Master Plan recommended that some 50,000 lower division students be diverted from the University of California and the California State Unversity and Colleges into the public community colleges by 1975. This diversion was achieved primarily through the alterations in eligibility pools described in Chapter V. However, the Master Plan also recommended that state funding of the community colleges' current operating expenses be increased to 45%. This recommendation was not implemented. Thus, the community colleges have been forced to absorb a vast increase of students without any significant expansion of state support.

> *Recommendation #47.* *Procedures and methods should be devised and adopted by the Legislature that will*

increase the proportion of state support for community colleges to approximately 45% by 1975.

Budgeting and Auditing

The Legislature and the executive branch are responsible for assuring accountability of expenditures of state funds in higher education. Methods for auditing public funds should be directly related to the program, purposes and formula used in determining the initial allocation. Inflexible application of rigid formulas are not particularly effective and may be counter-productive in terms of efficiency and cost/benefit considerations.

It appears that it may also be counter-productive for the segments to inflexibly apply budgeting formulas to the individual subunits within the campuses of the segments. Diversity and imagination may be stifled by the central administrations if there is inflexible auditing of the internal units.*

> *Recommendation #48.* *Except in unusual circumstances, the budgeting and auditing methods of state government should emphasize program budget review and approval and programmatic accountability.*
>
> *Recommendation #49.* *System offices of the segments should not inflexibly apply the funding formulae developed for the segments to subunits of individual campuses. Each segment should develop and implement administrative means for providing to each campus the broadest flexibility of operation consistent with responsible management.*

---

*For a more detailed discussion of this subject see pages 100-103 of the report of the Coordinating Council's Select Committee on the Master Plan for Higher Education.

AFTERWORD

The future of our state and society depends largely upon the quality of education available to our citizens.

In an age of automation, technology, affluence and mass media, increasing education has become a practical necessity. Education beyond the high school has already become a reality for most Californians. This will be no less true in coming years.

We live in a time of remarkable uncertainties. We find ourselves challenged by profound and perplexing questions of peace and war, race and sex, work and leisure; drugs and violence, exploration of space, ecological crises, liberation movements, and biological revolution.

Amidst it all, changes are eagerly sought by some and eagerly fought by others. Some people envision the future as an extrapolation of the past, others foresee radical departures. Some want our educational institutions to socialize and prepare people to maintain our present society's values and institutions; others want education to prepare persons to change society.

The differences extend even to the learning process itself. Some persons conceptualize education as training of the intellect; others propose to include the affective domain. Some advocate traditional and disciplined structure; others suggest independent study and experiential learning.

As a committee we do not favor one or the other of these positions. We value the diversity of opinions and judgments held by individual Californians, indeed by members of this Committee. We do not believe that either life or education need be the same for everyone.

The major task for postsecondary education is to meet these divergent hopes and expectations of Californians.

II

During our study we have found several assumptions implicit in the way many persons view postsecondary education. We have come to be skeptical about the continuing validity of these assumptions, and believe critical reevaluation is essential to the survival of California postsecondary education.

We question whether

- The "good old days," usually referring to the early 1960's, will return shortly. We can already see that the conditions of the 1970's are markedly different.

- A change in political leadership of the legislative and/or executive branch of government will dramatically improve the financial condition of higher education. Throughout the nation, governors and legislatures of both parties and all philosophies have found themselves constrained by fiscal conditions and more concerned with accountability.

- Every campus can be self-sufficient and all-inclusive. It seems clear that enrollments and fiscal conditions will not permit the duplication involved in making every campus comprehensive.

- The quality of an institution depends upon the selectivity of its admissions standards rather than upon what happens to the student while he or she is in the institution. Highly selective campuses often have the least effect upon a student.

- Low or no tuition serves the poor. The vast majority of those who benefit are not poor.

- The scientific method is the only legitimate method of learning. Other types of experiential learning occur throughout our society. Who is to say which is more valuable or significant?

- Educational institutions are the best dispensers of knowledge in our society. Rapidly emerging technologies can deliver knowledge anywhere.

- Published research is a necessary condition of good teaching. No necessary correlation between teaching and research has been proven.

- A Ph.D. degree is an essential qualification for college and university teaching. The Ph.D. is primarily a research degree with little preparation for teaching involved in its acquisition.

We invite the academic community to apply its critical method and spirit to these assumptions.

III

In our recommendations we have suggested policies for some of the immediate and pressing issues of California postsecondary education. More importantly we have recommended processes--particularly in governance, coordination and planning--by which California might better meet the needs of our people for postsecondary education in the future. We have no illusions, however, that even a study of this scope and duration can resolve or even identify all the significant issues.

Already several significant policy questions are evident.*

- How will the work and leisure patterns change and what impact will such changes have on postsecondary education?

- What are the policy implications of declining birth rates and decreasing rates of participation in higher education? Are these permanent or temporary trends?

- If enrollments level or even decline significantly in the near future, what criteria--qualitative and quantitative--will determine whether programs or courses should be reevaluated or even discontinued? What advance guidelines will facilitate planning and minimize political and parochial influences?

---

*See Chapter IX for forthcoming policy questions on financing

- How can women and minority groups become better represented on the staffs of our postsecondary education institutions?

- What role will adult education play in the future? Will increased enrollments of persons over the traditional age of college attendance offset possible declines in the conventional age group?

- How can the administrative and structural barriers between the various types of postsecondary education--academic, vocational, experiential, etc.--be bridged to provide better coordination and articulation?

- How can the administrative and structural barriers between postsecondary and "lower" education be bridged to provide better coordination and articulation?

- How can governance be decentralized and the trend toward bureaucratization of postsecondary education be curbed?

- Should we have collective bargaining in postsecondary education? If so, what are the implications for governance?

- Should limits be set upon the sizes of campuses and multicampus systems?

- Will our present tenure and other personnel practices provide for adequate flexibility, accountability and infusion of new talent into our academic institutions, particularly as we enter a period of decreased growth or decline?

- Should the trend toward accountability be formally broadened to include chief executives of systems and campuses? Should a specific (renewable) term of office be established for presidents and chancellors?

- Would some advanced degree such as the Doctor of Arts be better preparation for teaching careers than the research-oriented Ph.D?

- Should accreditation continue to be a function of private agencies? Have accrediting procedures enforced conformity to conventional standards at the expense of innovation and diversity? Do accrediting mechanisms help or hinder accountability?

These are only a few of the difficult and complex questions which are emerging. Their resolution will require leadership, courage and sensitivity on the part of the higher education community and public policy-makers. The period of most rapid growth and crisis management is behind us. The issues of the present and future will be more qualitative than quantitative, and more concerned with the substance of educational policy than with the mathematics of growth.

IV

Finally, we recognize the limitations of constitutional, statutory or other structural change, especially when imposed from outside. We know that the value and relevance of education will not be legislated. No matter how we structure postsecondary education, it will ultimately be those persons within the institutions who will breathe life or death into postsecondary education. For in the last analysis, people, far more than institutions, determine the course of history and the course of education.

APPENDIX A

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE MASTER PLAN FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

Recommendation #1. The Legislature shall adopt a statement of legislative intent articulating broad statewide goals for California postsecondary education for the next decade, to include:

A. Academic freedom and responsibility;
B. Equal and universal accessibility for persons of both sexes and all races, ancestries, incomes, ages and geographies;
C. Lifelong learning opportunities for persons with capacity and motivation to benefit;
D. Diversity of institutions, services and methods;
E. Flexibility to adapt to the changing needs of students and society;
F. Cooperation between institutions in assessing area educational needs and resources, and meeting those needs;
G. Involvement with local communities in providing educational services and utilizing community resources in the educational process;
H. Increased understanding of the learning process--to be sought and applied throughout higher education;
I. Discovery of qualitative and quantitative evaluation methods for learning, research and teaching;
J. Accountability throughout postsecondary education including:
    1) accountability of institutions to the individual (for instruction and related services),
    2) accountability of institutions to the public and its representatives,
    3) accountability of the individual (faculty, student, staff) to the institutions, and
    4) accountability of the public and its leaders to the institutions (for support and development).

Recommendation #2. The University of California may provide instruction in the liberal arts and sciences and in the professions, including the teaching professions. It shall have exclusive jurisdiction in public higher education over instruction in the profession of law and over graduate instruction in the professions of medicine, dentistry and veterinary medicine. It has the sole authority in public higher education to award the doctoral degree in all fields of learning, except that it may agree with the California State University and Colleges to award joint doctoral degrees in selected fields. It shall be the primary state-supported academic agency for research.

Recommendation #3. The California State University and Colleges shall have as its primary function the provision of undergraduate instruction and graduate instruction through the Master's degree. Presently established two-year programs in agriculture are authorized, but other two-year programs shall be permitted only when mutually agreed upon by the Trustees of the California State University and Colleges and the California Community Colleges. The doctoral degree may be awarded jointly with the University of California or with a private institution of postsecondary education accredited by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges through the procedures established for new program approval. Faculty research is authorized to the extent that it is consistent with the primary function of the California State University and Colleges.

Recommendation #4. Public community colleges shall offer instruction through but not beyond the second year of college. These institutions may grant the Associate in Arts and the Associate in Science degree. Their program may include but shall not be limited to: standard collegiate courses for transfer to other institutions; instruction in vocational and technical fields leading to employment; general or liberal arts courses; and community services.

Recommendation #5. Within such differentiation of segmental function, the institutions shall undertake intersegmental cooperation when it can:

A. enhance the achievement of the institutional missions shared by the segments;
B. enable public and private postsecondary education to more effectively meet the educational needs of a geographic region; or
C. provide more effective planning of postsecondary education on a statewide basis.

Recommendation #6. The University of California and the California State University and Colleges should extend the principle of differentiation to campuses within their systems. The four-year segments should develop missions for their several campuses with more specificity and delineation than "general campus" and "statewide program."

Recommendation #7. Appointed governing board members of the three segments of higher education shall be selected by the Governor from a list of five persons submitted for each vacancy by a nominating committee.

A. The nominating committee shall be composed of:
  1) the Superintendent of Public Instruction (Chairman)
  2) the Speaker and Minority Leader of the Assembly
  3) the President Pro Tempore and Minority Leader of the Senate
  4) the chairman of each segmental governing board
  5) an alumni representative from each segment, chosen by alumni in a manner determined by each segmental governing board after consultation with alumni
  6) a peer-selected faculty member from each segment, chosen in a manner determined by each segmental governing board after consultation with representative faculty organizations
  7) a peer-selected student from each segment chosen in a manner determined by each segmental governing board after consultation with representative student organizations.

B. The alumni, faculty and student representatives on the nominating committee may not be members of segmental governing boards.

C. Committee members designated in A(4)-(7) above shall vote only on nominations for their own segmental board.

D. Senate confirmation of governing board members shall be eliminated.

Recommendation #8. Segmental governing boards shall be broadly representative of the general public including ethnic minorities and women.

A. Both the nominating committee in preparing its list of nominees and the Governor in his appointing shall be responsible for compliance.

B. The nominating committee shall be responsible for nominating a variety of persons of different backgrounds, ideologies and opinions.

Recommendation #9. Terms of appointed Regents, Trustees and members of the Board of Governors shall be eight years.

Recommendation #10. The Board of Regents of the University of California and the Board of Trustees of the California State University and Colleges shall each consist of the following twenty-two voting members and two nonvoting members.

- A. The Governor, President Pro Tempore of Senate, Speaker of the Assembly and Superintendent of Public Instruction.
- B. The Chief Executive of the respective system
  - 1) The President of the University of California shall be a regent.
  - 2) The Chancellor of the California State University and Colleges shall be a trustee.
- C. An alumni representative of the respective system.
  - 1) The alumni regent shall be the president of the University of California Alumni Association.
  - 2) The alumni trustee shall be selected by alumni in a manner determined by the Trustees after consultation with California State University and Colleges alumni.
- D. Sixteen public members appointed in accordance with Recommendation #7.
- E. A peer-selected faculty member and peer-selected student of the respective system.
  - 1) They shall be nonvoting members, with the right of full participation in all sessions.
  - 2) Selection procedures shall be determined by the Legislature after consultation with student and faculty representatives.
- F. The representation of the Mechanics Institute and the State Board of Agriculture on the Board of Regents shall be eliminated.

Recommendation #11. The Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges shall consist of the following:

- A. Sixteen public members appointed in accordance with Recommendation #7.
- B. One alumni representative appointed in accordance with Recommendation #7.
- C. A peer-selected faculty member and peer-selected student shall be nonvoting members with the right of full participation in all sessions. The procedure for selection shall be determined by the Legislature after consultation with student and faculty representatives.

Recommendation #12. The Legislature shall provide conflict of interest and disclosure provisions for members of segmental governing boards.

APPENDIX A (continued)

Recommendation #13. The University of California shall be constitutionally autonomous. The powers of the Regents shall remain as currently specified except with respect to student charges for instruction and instructional facilities.*

Recommendation #14. The "Master Plan" approach shall be replaced by a continuous planning process which includes:

A. A legislative study of California postsecondary education at ten-year intervals to reevaluate the planning process and provide guidelines regarding goals, societal needs and general missions of public higher education and its components.
B. Continuous planning by a state commission including a five-year plan which is to be updated annually.

Recommendation #15. The Coordinating Council for Higher Education shall be abolished.

Recommendation #16. There shall be a Postsecondary Education Commission created, with constitutional recognition.

A. The Legislature shall determine the membership, powers and functions of the Commission.
B. The professional staff of the Commission shall be exempt from civil service regulations.
C. The Commission shall have the power to require the governing boards and the institutions of public postsecondary education to submit data on plans and programs, costs, selection and retention of students, enrollments, plant capacities and other matters pertinent to effective planning, policy development, articulation and coordination.

Recommendation #17. The Postsecondary Education Commission shall be established with the following functions and responsibilities in its capacity as the statewide postsecondary education planning agency and advisor to the Legislature and Governor.

A. It shall require the governing boards of the segments of public postsecondary education to develop and submit to the Commission institutional and systemwide long-range plans in a form specified.
B. It shall prepare a five-year state plan for postsecondary education which shall integrate the planning efforts of the public segments and other pertinent plans. Conflicts or inconsistencies among

---

*See Recommendation #41

segmental plans shall be resolved by the Commission in consultation with the segments. If such consultations are unsuccessful, the Commission shall report the unresolved issues to the Legislature with recommendations for resolution.

1) The state plan shall include, but need not be limited to, consideration of the following:
    a) the need for and location of new facilities,
    b) the range and kinds of programs appropriate to each institution or system,
    c) the budgetary priorities of the institutions and systems of postsecondary education,
    d) appropriate levels of fees, tuition and other student charges, and the impact of such charges on students and on postsecondary educational programs and institutions,
    e) appropriate levels of state-funded student financial aid,
    f) access and admissions of students to postsecondary education, and
    g) the provisions differentiating the functions of the public systems of higher education.
2) It shall update the state plan annually.

C. It shall advise the executive and legislative branches at appropriate stages in the budgetary process as to whether segmental budgetary requests are programmatically compatible with the state plan. It is not intended that the Commission hold independent budget hearings.

D. It shall determine the need for and location of new institutions and campuses of higher education. (The Legislature shall reaffirm its intent not to authorize or acquire sites for new institutions of higher education unless recommended by the Commission.)

E. It shall review segmental proposals for new programs and make recommendations regarding funding to the Legislature and the Governor. ("New Programs" means all proposals for new schools or colleges, all programs leading to a graduate or undergraduate degree which have not appeared in a segment's academic plan during the previous two years, and all proposals for new research institutes or centers which have not appeared in a segment's academic plan during the previous years.)

F. It shall, in consultation with the segments, establish a schedule for segmental review of selected educational programs, evaluate the program review processes of the segments and report its findings and recommendations to the Governor and the Legislature.

G. It shall serve as a stimulus to the segments and institutions of postsecondary education by projecting and identifying societal and educational needs and encouraging adaptability to change.

H. It shall develop and submit plans to the Legislature and the Governor for the funding and administration of a program to encourage innovative educational programs by institutions of postsecondary education.

I. It shall collect and/or conduct studies of projected manpower supply and demand, in cooperation with appropriate state agencies, and disseminate the results of such studies to institutions of postsecondary education and to the public in order to improve the information base upon which student choices are made.

J. It shall periodically review the need for and availability of postsecondary programs for adult and continuing education and develop guidelines for the establishment of such programs.

K. It shall develop criteria for evaluating the effectiveness of all aspects of postsecondary education, whenever possible, basing evaluation criteria upon qualitative and quantitative programmatic outcomes.

L. It shall maintain a current inventory of all off-campus programs and facilities for education, research and community service operated by public and private institutions of postsecondary education.

M. It shall act as the official state clearinghouse for postsecondary education information and shall provide information as requested to the Legislature, the Governor and appropriate agencies. It shall develop a comprehensive data base insuring comparability of data from diverse sources.

N. It shall develop criteria for state support of new and existing programs in consultation with the public segments, the Department of Finance and the Joint Legislative Budget Committee.

O. It shall approve or disapprove all proposals for changes in eligibility pools for admission to public institutions of postsecondary education.

P. It shall report annually, with recommendations, to the Legislature and the Governor regarding the financial conditions of independent institutions, their enrollment and application figures, the number of student spaces available and the respective cost of utilizing those spaces as compared to providing additional public spaces.

APPENDIX A (continued)

Q. It shall, upon request of the Legislature or the Governor, submit to the Legislature and the Governor reports on matters pertinent to statewide postsecondary education planning and coordination; it may from time to time, submit to the Governor and the Legislature reports containing recommendations on necessary or desirable changes in the functions, policies and programs of the several segments of public and private postsecondary education.

R. It may undertake such other advisory and information gathering functions and responsibilities as are compatible with its role as the statewide postsecondary education planning agency.

S. It shall assume reponsibilities heretofore assigned to the Coordinating Council for Higher Education through legislative resolution and budget language.

Recommendation #18. The Postsecondary Education Commission shall be composed of:

A. The chairmen of the Board of Regents of the University of California, the Board of Trustees of the California State University and Colleges, and the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges, or their designees from among the appointed members of their respective boards, serving at the pleasure of the appointing authority.

B. A representative of nonprofit independent higher education, appointed by the Governor for a three-year term, from a list submitted by an organization representative of those institutions.

C. The chairmen of the California Advisory Council on Vocational Education and Technical Training and the Council for Private Postsecondary Education Institutions or their designees from among the other members of their respective councils, serving at the pleasure of the respective appointing authority.

D. The President of the State Board of Education or his designee from among the other members of the board, serving at the pleasure of the appointing authority.

E. Twelve representatives of the general public appointed for six-year terms as follows: four by the Governor, four by the Senate Rules Committee and four by the Speaker of the Assembly.

Members of the Commission shall not be employees of any institution of postsecondary education.

APPENDIX A (continued)

The Commission shall be selected so as to be broadly representative of the population at large in terms of sex, race and economic and ethnic background. The appointing authorities shall confer to assure that their combined appointments comply.

Recommendation #19. The Legislature shall improve its policy staff capacity in postsecondary education.

Recommendation #20. The Postsecondary Education Commission shall have the following responsibilities under PL 92-318 (Education Amendments of 1972).

A. It shall be designated the "State Postsecondary Education Commission" under Section 1202 with the following functions and powers:
   1) Comprehensive statewide planning for postsecondary education (all functions and duties delineated in Section 1203 of the Education Amendments of 1972).
   2) Statewide planning for and establishment of an advisory council on community colleges (all functions and duties in relation to Title X, Sections A and B of the Education Amendments of 1972).
   3) All functions and duties in relation to the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963, Titles I and IV as amended, and Title I (Continuing Education) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 as amended.
   4) Commenting to the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare on proposals for the improvement of postsecondary education (for reviewing and recommending functions required by Section 404 (b) of the Education Amendments of 1972).
   5) Affirming when appropriate that an institution of higher education applying for federal emergency assistance is in distress (the functions and duties required of "the appropriate State agency" as designated in Section 122 (b) (2) of the Education Amendments of 1972).

B. It shall be designated the agency responsible for fiscal management and administration of federal aid for community colleges and occupational education under Section 1055 of the Education Amendments of 1972.
   1) This agency shall be charged with the sole administration of the plans for occupational education developed by the 1202 Commission (Title X, Section B.)

APPENDIX A (continued)

2) To aid in the administrative and fiscal duties imposed by Title X, Section B on the 1055 agency, the Commission should establish a panel of such persons from the postsecondary community as it deems appropriate. (Section 1055 requires the continued use of the existing State Advisory Council on Vocational Education with the same responsibilities as provided in the Vocational Education Act of 1963).

Recommendation #21. The Postsecondary Education Commission and central offices of all public segments of postsecondary education shall be located in Sacramento.

Recommendation #22. The Legislature shall reaffirm the commitment of the State of California to provide an appropriate place in California public higher education for every student willing and able to benefit from attendance.

Recommendation #23. The following admissions criteria shall be adopted:

A. The California Community Colleges shall accept all applicants who are high school graduates and all adults who can benefit from the instruction offered.

B. The California State University and Colleges shall select first-time freshmen from among the 33 1/3% of high school graduates most capable of benefiting from the instruction offered.

C. The University of California shall select first-time freshmen from among the 12 1/2% of high school graduates most capable of benefiting from the instruction offered.

D. Both the California State University and Colleges and the University of California shall have the flexibility to utilize nontraditional criteria for accepting up to 12 1/2% of their lower division students.
    1) to meet the objective specified in Recommendation #24
    2) to conduct controlled experiments designed to identify those students who are most capable of profiting from their instructional programs.

E. Each segment shall report annually to the Legislature through the Postsecondary Education Commission on the use of nontraditional admissions criteria.

F. The criteria set forth in this recommendation shall not necessarily be applied to innovative programs designed to serve adults beyond the normal age of college attendance.

APPENDIX A (continued)

G. The segments and/or institutions of higher education may with the approval of the Postsecondary Education Commission alter the eligibility pools established in B, and C, and the flexibility level in D above. The conditions which might justify alteration include:
   1) new knowledge based upon controlled experiments, carried out within the segments, which might provide a new basis for targeting students most likely to profit from instruction offered
   2) capacities of segments and institutions
   3) the needs of a geographic area
   4) the programs of a specific institution

H. Admissions policies within the parameters specified in these recommendations need not be applied uniformly within each segment. The criteria are sufficiently flexible to allow for and encourage diversity of student mix within multicampus systems.

Recommendation #24. Each segment of California public higher education shall strive to approximate by 1980 the general ethnic, sexual and economic composition of the recent California high school graduates.

A. This goal shall be achieved by provision of additional student spaces and not by the rejection of any qualified student; the Legislature shall commit the resources necessary to implement this policy.

B. The institutions and segments shall consider the following methods for fulfilling this policy.
   1) affirmative efforts to search out and connect with qualified students
   2) experimentation to discover alternate means of evaluating student potential
   3) augmented student financial assistance programs
   4) improved counseling for disadvantaged students

C. Each segment shall prepare a plan for achieving this objective and report annually to the Postsecondary Education Commission on its progress, including specification as to what obstacles stand in the way of further implementation. The Commission shall integrate and transmit the reports to the Legislature with evaluations and recommendations.

APPENDIX A (continued)

Recommendation #25. A major goal of California for the remainder of the 1970's shall be to insure that considerations of quality early schooling, ethnic grouping, family income, geographic location and age no longer impede the access of any citizen who can benefit from higher education.

Recommendation #26. Fee structures, admissions policies and financial aids policies and programs shall not discriminate against part-time students and students choosing to combine or alternate education with other experience such as work or travel.

Recommendation #27. The state shall establish on an experimental basis (piloted for five years) independent postsecondary education counseling centers in several urban and rural areas.

- A. These centers shall offer college opportunity information and counseling to any potential applicant.
- B. Counseling shall include information on proprietary schools and vocational education opportunities as well as higher education.
- C. The centers shall provide continually updated information for high school counselors responsible for college counseling.
- D. They shall coordinate recruiting and counseling pools among neighboring institutions to facilitate admission of educationally disadvantaged candidates.
- E. Where local needs dictate, information and counseling should be available in other languages as well as English.
- F. The Postsecondary Education Commission shall be responsible for administering, staffing and evaluating these programs.
- G. Staff shall be employees of the Postsecondary Education Commission.

The Postsecondary Education Commission shall develop and submit to the Legislature a plan for establishing these centers.

Recommendation #28. To facilitate the transfer of qualified students from two-year to four-year colleges and universities:

- A. The University of California and California State University and Colleges shall continue to maintain a ceiling of 40% lower division students (we intend this to be a ceiling, not a floor; a campus may fall below 40% or even eliminate the lower division if circumstances justify).

B. Transfer students who were eligible for admission as freshmen to a four-year segment and who have maintained satisfactory academic standing shall continue to be eligible for admission at any undergraduate level to that segment.
C. Each campus within the four-year segments of public higher education shall implement measures to insure that upper division transfer students receive parity in admissions and course enrollments with previously enrolled students.
D. The Postsecondary Education Commission shall assume responsibility for coordinating transfer procedures among the public segments of California higher education.

Recommendation #29. Insofar as the four year segments use high school achievement as a criterion for freshman admissions:
A. The high school records used shall normally begin with the 10th year;
B. Methods shall be devised to assess competencies rather than requiring specific high school courses;
C. When specific courses are required, no student attending high school on a full-time basis shall be required to devote more than two-thirds of his program to fulfilling course requirements.

Recommendation #30. The Postsecondary Education Commission shall prepare and transmit to the Legislature a plan for establishing regional councils throughout the state; each council shall be composed of community representatives and representatives of each institution within the region.

The regional councils shall promote interinstitutional cooperation and comprehensive regional planning. Specific functions shall include:
A. Surveying total demand, present and projected, for postsecondary education in each region;
B. Surveying availability of public and private resources to meet demands for postsecondary education;
C. Finding methods for effectively utilizing or increasing educational resources;
D. Encouraging the development of policies and procedures for the cross-registration of students and sharing of faculty and facilities.

APPENDIX A (continued)

Recommendation #31. Regional planning shall have high priority in the use of federal grants for comprehensive statewide planning.

Recommendation #32. The state shall establish a fourth segment of California public postsecondary education.

- A. Responsibilities shall include:
  - 1) developing and submitting to the Postsecondary Education Commission and the Legislature a state plan for extended forms of higher education. The purpose of such a plan is to: coordinate the segmental efforts, statewide and regionally; provide for development of new programs when there are needs unmet by the other statewide segments; and establish policies and procedures in such areas as funding, admissions and financial aids;
  - 2) awarding credits on the basis of experiential learning and equivalency tests;
  - 3) maintaining a credit bank for persons who accumulate academic credit through several channels: postsecondary institutions, work experience, tests;
  - 4) awarding degrees and certificates;
  - 5) developing and implementing alternative delivery systems including individualized and independent study.
- B. This segment shall consist of a minimum of administrative staff and faculty but shall have no campuses.
- C. The Legislature, through the Postsecondary Education Commission or a joint committee, in either case with the assistance of a citizens' advisory committee, shall develop a plan for the establishment of this segment, including governance mechanisms and representation on the Postsecondary Education Commission.

Recommendation #33. The Postsecondary Education Commission shall study the proposal for an institution operated by nonacademic professionals and report to the Legislature on the need, feasibility and costs.

Recommendation #34. Each public institution of higher education in the state should redeploy a significant percentage of its annual operating budget for the purposes of supporting innovative programs.

APPENDIX A (continued)

Recommendation #35. The Legislature shall establish a fund to support innovation in postsecondary education.

A. The fund shall be supported at the level of 3% of the annual state operating budget for postsecondary education.
B. It shall be utilized to support: innovative proposals for providing educational services to new clientele; new curriculum and pedagogy; greater cost effectiveness and productivity.
C. Individuals or institutions in nonprofit postsecondary education shall be eligible for grants.
D. A minimum of 10% of each grant shall be used for evaluation and dissemination of results.
E. Absent special justification, no project shall be supported by this fund for more than three years.
F. The Postsecondary Education Commission shall develop and submit to the Legislature a plan for administering the innovation fund.

Recommendation #36. California's independent colleges and universities shall have representation on the Postsecondary Education Commission.*

Recommendation #37. The Legislature shall urge California's independent institutions to participate (voluntarily) in the state programs for interinstitutional cooperation and regional consortia.

Recommendation #38. The Legislature shall expand existing student financial assistance programs which allow the student to utilize his aid at independent institutions.**

Recommendation #39. Any additional financial aid to independent institutions shall be channeled through the student.

Recommendation #40. The Postsecondary Education Commission shall annually report, with recommendations, to the Legislature and Governor regarding the financial conditions of independent institutions, their enrollment and application figures, the number of student spaces available and the respective cost of utilizing those spaces versus providing additional public spaces.

Recommendation #41. The Legislature shall determine whether or not students in public postsecondary education shall be charged for instruction and instructional facilities and the amount of any such charges.

---

*See Recommendation #18
**See Recommendation #43

Recommendation #42. If charges are levied for instructional purposes, funds derived shall not be used to finance construction of physical facilities for instructional purposes. Student financial aids shall have the first priority in the use of such funds.

Recommendation #43. The Legislature shall create and operate a comprehensive interrelated program of state financial assistance. It shall appropriate supportive funds to the State Scholarship and Loan Commission on the following allocation basis:

A. The State Scholarship Program at a level of 5% of high school graduates. This program shall be increased at an annual rate of .5% until the 5% level is achieved
B. The College Opportunity Grant Program at a level of 1% of high school graduates.
C. The Educational Opportunity Program at a level of 5% of full-time equivalent enrollment or average daily attendance excluding adult education at an average of at least $500.00 per award. The Commission shall allocate the EOP money to campuses on the basis of need, except that no institution shall receive a level of support less than 2% of full-time students.
D. The Occupational Education and Training Grant Program at a level of .5% of high school graduates.
E. The Graduate Fellowship Program at the currently authorized level of 2% of A.B. degrees; recipients shall be limited to four renewals.

The levels and amounts of the awards of the various programs shall be reviewed annually by the Scholarship and Loan Commission which shall recommend such adjustments as it finds necessary to the Governor and Legislature.

Recommendation #44. The California State Scholarship and Loan Commission shall report to the Legislature on the need for and methods of implementing a state work-study program to provide financial assistance to students in public postsecondary education.

Recommendation #45. The following proposals for increasing educational productivity and costs effectiveness should be considered carefully by each institution of higher education:

A. Acceleration of certificate and degree programs where consistent with educational quality;
B. Creating new graduate programs only under exceptional circumstances of student demand and societal need;
C. Greater use of advanced placement and challenge examinations;
D. Interinstitutional and intersegmental cooperation, including sharing of facilities and faculty and concurrent enrollment of students;
E. Continued review by the public segments of the feasibility of cooperative arrangements as a major criterion in the capital review process;
F. Greater use of technology, particularly tapes, television and other media which are conducive to student self-paced learning and educational flexibility;
G. Development of methods to encourage cost effectiveness at all levels including incentives such as additional funds for innovation from savings achieved;
H. Improvement of management techniques and information systems, including the development of capacity to compare costs and results of comparable programs.
I. Development of an outcomes approach to budgeting for postsecondary education;
J. Utilization of all available academic and nonacademic facilities on and off campus;
K. Continued efforts to maximize facility utilization including evenings and weekends;
L. Provision of adequate support services to faculty to insure that their time and energies are freed for teaching and/or research;
M. Improvement of the transfer processes to insure removal of unreasonable barriers, particularly between two-year and four-year institutions and to avoid repetition of courses covering similar material;
N. Improved programmatic articulation with high schools to avoid unnecessary repetition of subject matter;
O. Continuing review of the feasibility of year-round operation;
P. Early admission of advanced high school students;
Q. Careful and vigorous monitoring of the growth of administrative staffs, particularly in the segmental central offices.

Recommendation #46. The Postsecondary Education Commission shall study and report to the Legislature on discrepancies in faculty compensation for teaching and research, including measures that the Legislature may take to assure equity in compensation for these functions.

APPENDIX A (continued)

Recommendation #47. Procedures and methods should be devised and adopted by the Legislature that will increase the proportion of state support for community colleges to approximately 45% by 1975.

Recommendation #48. Except in unusual circumstances, the budgeting and auditing methods of state government should emphasize program budget review and approval and programmatic accountability.

Recommendation #49. System offices of the segments should not inflexibly apply the funding formulae developed for the segments to subunits of individual campuses. Each segment should develop and implement administrative means for providing to each campus the broadest flexibility of operation consistent with responsible management.

APPENDIX B

INDIVIDUAL COMMENTS OF JOINT COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Page

I. Dennis Carpenter 105

II. Mervyn Dymally 109

III. Raymond Gonzales 113

IV. John Stull 117

SACRAMENTO ADDRESS
STATE CAPITOL 95814
TELEPHONE: (916) 445-5831

DISTRICT ADDRESS
3912 CAMPUS DRIVE
NEWPORT BEACH, CA 92660
(714) 557-3200

DENNIS E. CARPENTER
THIRTY-FOURTH SENATORIAL DISTRICT
ORANGE COUNTY

CALIFORNIA LEGISLATURE

Senate

COMMITTEES
SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON CIVIL
DISORDER, CHAIRMAN
ELECTIONS AND REAPPORTIONMENT
FINANCE
INSURANCE AND FINANCIAL
INSTITUTIONS
NATURAL RESOURCES AND
WILDLIFE

JOINT COMMITTEES
MASTER PLAN FOR HIGHER
EDUCATION
REVISION OF THE ELECTIONS CODE

COMMISSION OF THE CALIFORNIAS

September 14, 1973

MEMORANDUM

TO: John Vasconcellos, Chairman
Joint Committee on the Master Plan for Higher Education

RE: Minority Opinion Submitted by Senator Dennis E. Carpenter on the Report of the Joint Committee on the Master Plan for Higher Education.

With regard to recommendations 7, 8, 10 and 11, it is the philosophy of the majority of the committee that these recommended structural changes will elevate the decision-making process of the various governing boards to a higher level of responsiveness to the educational needs and desires of the people of California through a feeling of participatory and societal representation. I believe this to be false.

The committee report posits the theorem that "If higher education is to be responsive to the diverse needs of a pluralistic society, those who govern must be drawn from diverse backgrounds." It appears that the philosophy of the committee majority is that responsiveness and creativity can be the product of structures. This is an odd notion and in fact contrary to the philosophy embodied in other recommendations which seem to aim at encouraging flexibility of structures.

The committee does not examine whether or not its changes in the appointment process of the governing boards are necessary in terms of any deficiencies that can be readily traced to the present structure. Rather, the committee majority assumes that the present appointment process is no longer appropriate by virtue of the fact of its prior existence.

An inarticulated corollary to the position of the committee majority that changes must be made in the appointive process, is that the present process is incapable of evolving in its structures of responses of the educational needs of the people and that drastic change is necessary. This is historically incorrect.

It is a fallacy to assume that the devices supported by the committee majority will promote a greater democratization of the various governing boards. Whether appointments are made by the Governor or by a committee, the process remains political, and, in fact, becomes more political due to the need then for a prospective appointee to garner support from committee members. This entire process will become more shielded from public scrutiny than the current appointment process. There is no evidence that a person who successfully negotiates the political thicket of committee recommendations will in any way be representative of his peers, rather, it would be more logical to assume that he will be representative of the support which he managed to gather in the committee.

It is a disservice to those from whom the committee wishes input to assume that they all think in a manner identical to a person who manages to successfully achieve committee recommendation.

It is impossible to provide structures that will, of themselves, insure competent people as members of the governing boards. The necessary element to insure boards that will provide leadership, protect academic freedom and the public trust is in impressing the appointing power with the primacy of these considerations. If this is not accomplished, then no structure or administrative device will serve in its stead, and if this is accomplished, no structure or administrative device, other than legislative review, is necessary.

It is the responsibility of segmental boards to provide sound administration to our institutions of higher learning and it is the responsibility of our elected officials to provide policy overview and to be concerned with the responsiveness of our higher educational institutions to the people's educational needs. To remove the appointment process from the public through the device of committee lists does not serve the need for sound administration. The committee has misplaced its priorities if it thinks that by focusing on group input to the segmental board it can achieve what is properly achieved by public input to those who are responsible for formulating public policy.

In recommendations 17, 18, 20 and 21, that deal with the problem of the lack of statewide coordination, planning and policy development, the report of the majority chooses the device of creating a postsecondary education commission. The need to accomplish these things in California higher education is not questioned. However, while it is right that the establishment and goals of our institutions of higher learning be established in our State Constitution, it is not logical that an administrative device designed to promote coordination and planning be established in the Constitution. For this reason, I reject the concept that the postsecondary education commission should have constitutional recognition.

In establishing the postsecondary education commission with broad powers, the report of the majority fails to recognize the obligation and responsibility of elected public officials to fulfill the educational needs of Californians and urges that we abdicate this responsibility to an appointed commission. This is not to denigrate the need for a coordinating and planning commission, but rather to suggest that the Legislature and Governor have a responsibility to the people and to themselves to provide the direction and foresight necessary to insure the representativeness and responsiveness of education. In other words, the commission should not be regulatory in nature.

In their concern for the accessibility of the entire system of postsecondary education, the majority report chooses to treat the symptoms of a major societal problem and prescribe for their remedy, rather than deal with the cause. It is remarkable that in the report's discussion of the barriers to college attendance, no attempt was made to determine how these barriers may be related, not to educational experience, income, geography, and age, but rather to the roles in society ascribed to each of these factors. That is to say, the majority report correlated economic phenomena with access to higher education but did not attempt to describe which of these correlations are causal. It was once observed in 17th Century England, that there seemed to be a high birthrate in those homes which were marked by the nesting of storks on the chimneys thereof. There was a correlation but I doubt that it was causal.

In regard to insuring access of California's higher educational institutions to all qualified students, this goal should be accomplished through supplemental tutorial programs and counseling rather than through forced or mandated percentage distribution of students, which would substantially disrupt the present 3-tier system of higher education.

In regard to recommendation 30, the report of the majority ignores its earlier findings that the current system of higher education is plagued by a lack of coordination and rivalries which work against responsiveness and diversity. The proposal to establish regional councils, if adopted, can only result in allowing the local politics of these regions to place a drag on the entire system of higher education and would only provide input unrelated to the real needs of higher education. The goal of interinstitutional cooperation must, if it is to be realized, be coordinated by postsecondary education commissions.

In conclusion then I would recommend the following modifications to the recommendations of the majority report:

Recommendation 7 - eliminate

Recommendation 8 - eliminate

Recommendation 10 - eliminate

Recommendation 11 - eliminate

Recommendation 16 - delete reference to constitutional recognition.

Recommendation 17 - eliminate capital letter "D"
eliminate capital letter "E"

Recommendation 24 - change to read each segment of California higher education shall strive to achieve equal access regardless of family income, race, sex, age or religion.

Retain capital letters A, B and C.

Recommendation 30 - eliminate

Recommendation 31 - eliminate

SENATOR
MERVYN M. DYMALLY
CHAIRMAN
SENATE DEMOCRATIC CAUCUS

LEGISLATIVE OFFICE
STATE CAPITOL
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95814
916—445-2104

CALIFORNIA LEGISLATURE

Senate

September 10, 1973

Assemblyman John Vasconcellos
Chairman
Joint Committee on the Master Plan for Higher Education
Room 5150
State Capitol Building
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear John:

While I agree with the vast majority of the report of the Joint Committee on the Master Plan for Higher Education, I find I must dissent from some recommendations in the report and make recommendations of my own which the report neglects.

My dissent involves four specific areas:

1. I enthusiastically endorse the recommendations to put peer-selected student and faculty members on the governing boards of the University, State University and Colleges and Community Colleges, but I disagree with the report's recommendation that these student and faculty members be denied full voting rights.

   If our objectives are to make the governing boards less political and more responsive to the real needs of higher education, then I fail to see how those objectives can be better served than by allowing faculty and students the right to vote on decisions directly affecting them. Students and faculty are found to regard membership without voting rights as mere tokenism, and they would be right.

   I urge then that this recommendation be changed to permit the appointment of students and faculty to the governing boards of the three segments of public higher education without prejudice and with the same voting rights as all other members.

2. I also recommend the creation of a state-funded Center for the Study of Higher Education. This would be an unstructured critical group serving the needs of public higher education in California. The center would conduct a continuing review of the fundamental purposes of higher education and encourage dialogues among the various segments of higher education.

   I further believe that the naming of a new fourth segment of public higher education in this report, the Cooperative University, is premature. The development of this exciting, new "open college" concept should not be left to the Postsecondary Education Commission, which is, itself, so structured that it is likely to produce a rigidly structured new segment.

   Rather, the development of the new fourth segment should evolve from discussions and criticisms which would take place in the proposed outside study which has been authorized by the Legislature in SCR 81.

3. The report asks only plaintive questions about the issue of collective bargaining in postsecondary education, but it is the Committee's duty to propose public policy, not merely to ask questions about critical policy issues. The public has a right to a definite proposal from us on collective bargaining in higher education.

   I believe that the Committee should propose the granting of collective bargaining rights to faculty and other employees in California public higher education. Virtually every faculty group which has testified before the Legislature has said that the present system does not work and that collective bargaining is needed. We should take this opportunity to answer this need.

4. The report's goals for increasing minority representation in public higher education are admirable, but the report neglects to make a specific defense and other encouragement of Ethnic Studies programs. These programs are invaluable, both for the self-understanding of minority students and for creating greater understanding between the ethnic minority and the whole society.

Assemblyman John Vasconcellos
September 10, 1973
Page Three

> Further, in addition to encouraging greater minority enrollment, there should be positive sanctions against discrimination in hiring minorities and women in public higher education. The record indicates the sorry need for such sanctions.

With these exceptions, I support the Joint Committee report and I hope to see its recommendations implemented. I know you will understand that my dissent is motivated by a desire to improve the report, not to undermine it.

I have enjoyed my service on the Joint Committee and I will do whatever I can to see our recommendations enacted into Law.

Sincerely,

Mervyn M. Dymally

MERVYN M. DYMALLY

MMD: ljs

SACRAMENTO ADDRESS
STATE CAPITOL
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95814
TELEPHONE: (916) 445-8490

DISTRICT OFFICE
1910 BAKER STREET
BAKERSFIELD, CALIFORNIA 93305
TELEPHONE: (805) 327-8458

COMMITTEES
AGRICULTURE
REVENUE AND TAXATION
EDUCATION

Assembly
California Legislature

RAYMOND GONZALES
ASSEMBLYMAN, TWENTY-EIGHTH DISTRICT
VICE CHAIRMAN, EDUCATION

Dissenting Opinions on the Report of the Joint Committee on the Master Plan for Higher Education

I was appointed a member of the Joint Committee in March 1973, consequently, I was not involved in the early stages of planning and investigation conducted by the committee. However, since my appointment, the staff consultants have endeavored to bring me up to date and I have done the best I could to familiarize myself with the job that the Joint Committee had done up to March 1973. The following dissenting opinions are intended to indicate my belief that there may be alternatives to some of the proposals made by the Joint Committee. I totally support the thrust of the Joint Committee Report and am extremely grateful for my appointment to the committee and to the consideration that the Chairman, John Vasconcellos, has given me since my appointment.

Recommendation #2.--It is my belief that the sole authority in public higher education to award the doctoral degree in all fields of learning should not necessarily be that of the University of California. It is my belief that campuses of the California State University and Colleges that have developed superior programs in any given area may in the future have the capability of granting a doctoral degree in that specific discipline. There is evidence now that some state universities have programs that are in some respects superior to those offered by the University of California. Consequently, it is not unreasonable to believe that they will have the capability of offering a doctoral degree in the future.

Recommendation #10-E. (a peer-selected faculty member and a peer-selected student of the respective system. (1) They shall be nonvoting members, with the right of full participation in all sessions.) --It is my belief that the right of full participation suggests the right to vote. I believe that only if the peer-selected faculty and student representatives are eligible to vote shall they have equal status on the boards.

Recommendation #11-C.--I believe that peer-selected faculty members and peer-selected students of the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges should have the right to full participation in all sessions including the right to vote.

Recommendation #13.--I believe that too much distinction is made between the Regents of the University of California, the Trustees of the California State University and Colleges and the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges. I believe that either all segments of postsecondary education should be constitutionally autonomous or they should all be subject to the Legislature. I feel that this distinction has a negative effect on the relationship between the various segments of higher education in California.

Recommendation #24-B (4).--In regard to the phrase "improved counseling for disadvantaged students": This recommendation presupposes that counseling is adequate for all students at California's institutions of higher learning. It is my belief that a concerted effort must be made to improve counseling facilities and programs for all students at these institutions with perhaps an added emphasis for counseling the disadvantaged students.

Recommendation #43.--It is my opinion that no concerted effort has been made to establish sufficient funds for state loan programs. There should be no excuse to withhold funds on the loan basis to any student in California who can demonstrate need and ability. A program that would be self-sustaining could be developed to guarantee that any student who is in financial need and qualifies for admission to an institution at the postsecondary level can find funds available on a loan basis to pursue his education. Given the fact that the state is in a financial position to develop such a fund, there should be no hesitation to do so.

Comments--The Joint Committee on the Master Plan for Higher Education has in my opinion done a commendable job. However, I feel it has failed to recognize or comment on several significant shortcomings in the state educational program. It is my opinion that the state should commit itself to an all-out effort to alleviate the problems of the disadvantaged members of rural communities. It should involve the various segments of postsecondary education in a program of migrant education throughout the rural areas of California. There is no doubt that this segment of the population suffers more from educational neglect than any other in the state

One other shortcoming of the postsecondary education system in California is the failure of the State to establish a branch of the University of California in the southern San Joaquin Valley. It is my belief that professional schools of law, medicine, dentistry, etc., should be available to the residents of this region. Further, I believe that either California State University, Fresno or California State College, Bakersfield, should be redesignated as a branch of the University of California so that professional schools would be available to the residents of the southern San Joaquin Valley and the mountain areas that surround the valley. It should be noted that there is no branch of the University south of Davis within the San Joaquin Valley and I believe that data is available to demonstrate the needs of the population in this area. I encourage the Legislature to seek a remedy to this problem.

Room 4089
State Capitol
Sacramento 95814
(916) 445-3731

4817 Palm Avenue
Suite B
La Mesa 92041
(714) 462-5070

California State Senate

JOHN STULL
SENATOR
THIRTY-EIGHTH DISTRICT
San Diego County

COMMITTEES
Agriculture and Water Resources
Health and Welfare
Industrial Relations
Local Government
Vice Chairman, Joint Committee on Educational Goals and Evaluation

Honorable Ed Reinecke, President
and Members of the Senate
Honorable Bob Moretti, Speaker
and Members of the Assembly
State Capitol
Sacramento, California

Dear Ladies and Gentlemen:

The nature, scope and thoroughness of the report being submitted to you by the Joint Committee on the Master Plan for Higher Education are such that it is understandable for individual members of the Committee to disagree with certain of the recommendations and comments contained therein. And the purpose of this letter is to note and comment upon several selected items with which I both agree and disagree.

However, it is my hope that nothing said by me in disagreeing with certain aspects of the report will be construed as being meant in any way to demean the work of the Committee, its chairman, its staff, or its methodology. Thus, I wish at the outset to extend my highest commendation and thanks not only to the members of the Committee generally and those who participated in the many broad and in-depth hearings and studies which were conducted, but especially to Mr. Vasconcellos, a hardworking and dedicated chairman, and to Pat Callan, Dan Friedlander, Sue Powell and Nancy Wood, whose interest, courtesy, and sincere efforts to gather and incorporate countless diverse points of view have truly been outstanding.

Having served on the Committee for two years, and then having resigned due to my election to the Senate in March, 1973, my past and present comments could easily have been disregarded. Such has not been the case, however, and the Committee, through its chairman and staff, has continued to invite my participation in its deliberations and the final report drafting process even after I was no longer a member of the Committee. I greatly appreciate this consideration, and hereby acknowledge it.

This report contains many solid, necessary recommendations which should be implemented by the Legislature. Recommendation #1 is one such necessity. Similarly, I believe that the Committee's conclusion that "the most telling criticism of the California system is its fragmentation of responsibility which has led to a critical absence of statewide coordination, planning and policy development" (pp. 3-4) is valid, and will only be remedied through unselfish recognition and acceptance by all concerned that "educational leadership must be responsive to the public interest as well as to institutional needs" (p. 6). It is further my belief that Recommendation #40 is of the highest priority.

There are, however, several recommendations contained in the report with which I disagree. This was probably to be expected, but nonetheless such differences of opinion must be specifically identified and discussed.

1. With respect to Recommendations #7 and #8, the desire to achieve diversity of representation among the governing board members of the three segments of public higher education is a fine goal. However, I do not believe the procedures outlined in these two recommendations to be practical or workable. Will nineteen (19) state university and college campuses, or ninety-two (92) community college campuses, be able to select one alumni, one faculty, and/or one student representative who truly speaks for the diverse interests of the numerous campuses? Must the five names submitted to the Governor for each position include one male, one female, one black, one brown, one white, one "leftist," and one "rightist" as one mystical combination of talents and attributes? Must a "successful businessman" be balanced by an "unsuccessful" one? It is my firm belief that the procedures outlined in Recommendations #7 and #8 will not truly insulate governing boards from partisanship, especially when viewed in conjunction with Recommendation #9 (eight-year terms of office).

2. Recommendation #10 contains several weaknesses. Is it really desirable for the Chief Executives to be voting members of each governing board? Is this not tantamount to making an appointive city manager a voting member of a city council? I believe that Chief Executives should be fully participating, nonvoting members of each governing board, because they are involved in the day-to-day, working operation of each segment.

I also have strong reservations about limiting student representation. I question the wisdom of allowing student representatives to participate "fully," which would appear to include executive session considering personnel. Should a student be present when possibly one of his own professors is being considered for tenure? And, all students currently may attend governing board meetings. Would not this provision in fact be a limitation upon such participation, with individual students being channeled instead to their "student" representative"? And, would not students from larger campuses, such as Berkeley, Los Angeles, or Long Beach, tend to dominate? It is my firm belief that all student body presidents should be present and participate, rather than limiting such representation to one student spokesman on each board.

Additionally, because agriculture remains the number one industry in California (other than government), I believe the State Board of Agriculture should continue to have representation on the University Board of Regents.

3. Recommendation #11 contains the same weaknesses as Recommendation #10, if not more so. Can one alumni, one faculty and/or one student representative truly be expected to speak accurately for the diverse interests of ninety-two (92) campuses? And, it is my belief that attempting to implement a selection process for such representation would in itself make the proposal unworkable.

4. Although the concept embodied in Recommendation #13 is commendable, it appears to be a somewhat wishful attempt to have the best of two worlds. Either the University is constitutionally autonomous, or it is not. I do not believe that an exception can be made solely with respect to student charges. If this exception is made, I believe it logically opens the door to others. Is the question of student charges so unique as to require special exemption? Is it more important to the Legislature than, for example, the question of faculty salaries? Or the salary of the University President? Or the manner in which the University invests its funds? I do not believe so, and thus do not see this concept of "limited autonomy" to be realistic.

5. With respect to the idea of local campus governing boards (pp. 17-18), no specific recommendation has been made. Although this idea was one of the Committee's most controversial, the concept is one which I believe should be more fully explored. Accordingly, it is my suggestion that a pilot study be undertaken on one campus of each segment of public higher education to see if such local governing boards are beneficial.

6. "Change" does not always mean progress. Accordingly, with respect to Recommendation #14, I believe the word "updated" in section B should be deleted, and in its place be substituted the words, "reviewed and updated if necessary."

7. With respect to Recommendation #21, I do not believe that locating the central offices of each public segment in Sacramento is either necessary or truly desirable. This close proximity to the Governor and the Legislature would undoubtedly lead to an overemphasis on the relationship between higher education and government, to the detriment of a more fully integrated and balanced concern for the total needs and responsibilities of public higher education.

8. With respect to the entire chapter of the report relating to student access and retention (pp. 33-48), it is my firm belief that priority for qualified California residents and veterans must be reaffirmed.

9. With respect to Recommendation #23, I have strong reservations regarding section D (which in turn relates to Recommendation #24). Current legislative provision is made for four per cent (4%), and I have seen little evidence which would justify so great an expansion of this percentage, with its attendant cost implications.

10. With respect to Recommendation #24, I realize the problems which the Committee encountered in attempting to achieve this goal without setting specific quotas. However, this still embodies the quota concept, with which I disagree.

11. Recommendation #26 attempts to recognize the problems faced by working students and that fact that continuous, consecutive attendance and course completion may no longer be a feasible alternative for many of those seeking higher education. However, I believe this recommendation to be over-broad, and that it could lead to some abuse. Steps must be taken in some manner to deal with the "professional" student who is occupying space and consuming resources which more serious, more deserving students need.

12. Of special significance are the Committee's findings that "there is little evidence that the four-year institutions are more responsive to the learning needs of these students (those not meeting the top 12-1/2% and 33-1/3% admission requirements of the University or state university and colleges) than are the community colleges" and the expression of concern by the Committee "lest the community colleges be seen as convenient places to shepherd the 'less qualified' learners, or become places where their aspirations are cooled" (p. 48).

13. The concept of a fourth segment of California public postsecondary education embodied in Recommendation #32 is challenging, exciting, controversial. Full legislative consideration of this proposal is seriously recommended.

14. With respect to Recommendations #34 and #35, I see some conflict here. In one instance, the Committee recommends a "significant" percentage, and in the other, it recommends "3% of the annual operating budget for postsecondary education." What is "significant"? And is it really necessary to reinvent the wheel?

15. With respect to Recommendation #41, I would suggest the inclusion of the phrase "with the advice of the Postsecondary Education Commission" after the word " Legislature," so that the Commission is specifically involved with determinations relative to student charges.

16. With respect to Recommendation #43, I must admit that I have strong reservations at this time to appropriating some $22.9 million to the Educational Opportunity Grants Program.

These, then, are my comments on the report. Again, I must commend most highly the work of the Committee chairman, the Committee members, and the Committee staff. And I must again extend my thanks to them for allowing me to complete my participation in the preparation and presentation of this report.

Sincerely,

John Stull

John Stull
State Senator, 38th District

APPENDIX C

PUBLIC HEARINGS OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE MASTER PLAN FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

1971 - 1973

Subject	Date
Education for the Future of Education	September 17, 1971
Report of the Ad Hoc Advisory Committee	October 6, 1971
Joint Committee Study Plan	January 17, 1972
Structure of Public Higher Education	February 9, 1972
Governance and Coordination of California Higher Education	February 16 and February 23, 1972
Independent Higher Education	March 1, 1972
Alternative Forms of Higher Education	March 8 and March 22, 1972
Planning for Postsecondary Education	April 5, 1972
Financing Postsecondary Education	April 12 and April 19, 1972
Access to Higher Education	April 26 and May 3, 1972
Regional Articulation and Cooperation among Institutions of Higher Education (Subcommittee)-San Bernardino	May 22, 1972
Regional Articulation and Cooperation among Institutions of Higher Education (Subcommittee)-San Diego	September 11, 1972

APPENDIX C (continued)

Subject	Date
Coordinating Council for Higher Education Select Committee Report	January 3, 1973
Draft Report of the Joint Committee on the Master Plan for Higher Education	
State Capitol, Sacramento	March 2, 1973
University of California, Irvine	March 9, 1973
California State University, San Jose	March 16, 1973
El Camino College, Torrance	March 23, 1973
University of San Francisco	March 30, 1973

APPENDIX D

JOINT COMMITTEE DOCUMENTS AND PAPERS

Title	Author
California Postsecondary Education: Questions and Issues, Staff Report #1	JCMPHE Staff
A Summary of Major Proposals Considered by the Master Plan Survey Team in 1960	JCMPHE Staff
Study Plan	JCMPHE Staff
Financing Postsecondary Education in California	Academy for Educational Development, Inc.
Evaluating Higher Education in California	Michael Scriven
Graduate Education in California	Lewis Mayhew
The Role of Research in California Higher Education	Lewis Mayhew
Chicanos and Public Higher Education in California	Ronald W. Lopez and Darryl D. Enos
Independent Higher Education in California	Fred A. Nelson
Alternative Forms of Higher Education for California	Warren Bryan Martin
Interinstitutional Cooperation in California Higher Education	Academy for Educational Development, Inc.
Asian Americans and Public Higher Education in California	Robert B. Yoshioka
Blacks and Public Higher Education in California	Nairobi Research Institute: Ralph Dawson Robert Singleton
Goals for California Higher Education: A Survey of 116 College Communities	Richard E. Peterson

APPENDIX E

NOTES

Chapter IV

1. "From the Minutes of the Master Plan Survey Team," provided by the Coordinating Council for Higher Education, Sacramento.

Chapter V

1. Master Plan Survey Team, A Master Plan for Higher Education in California 1960-1975 (Sacramento: State Department of Education, 1960), p. 72.

2. Robert O. Bess, "Statement Before the Joint Committee on the Master Plan for Higher Education on Access to Higher Education," May 3, 1972.

3. K. Patricia Cross, "The New Learners," Change, V (February, 1973), p.31.

4. James W. Brant and Leland L. Medsker, Beyond High School (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1968).

5. Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, New Students and New Places (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1971), p. 97.

6. Northeastern California Higher Education Study, Council Report 72-7, Coordinating Council for Higher Education, December, 1972.

7. A. J. Jaffe and Walter Adams, "Two Models of Open Enrollment," in Logan Wilson (ed.), Universal Higher Education, Costs, Benefits, Options (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1972), pp. 223-251.

8. Frank Newman et al, Report on Higher Education (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1971) p. 1.

9. Alexander W. Astin, College Dropouts: A National Profile, ACE Research Reports, Vol. 7, No. 1, (February, 1972).

10. Newman, op. cit., p. 3.

Chapter VI

1. Academy for Educational Development, Inc., Interinstitutional Cooperation in California Higher Education (Sacramento: Joint Committee on the Master Plan for Higher Education, California Legislature, 1973).

Chapter VII

1. Michael Marien, "Space-Free/Time-Free Higher Learning: New Programs, New Institutions and New Questions," Notes on the Future of Education, 1972, p. 76.

2. Richard E. Peterson, Goals for California Higher Education: A Survey of 116 College Communities (Sacramento: Joint Committee on the Master Plan for Higher Education, California Legislature, 1973).

3. Warren B. Martin, Alternative Forms of Higher Education for California (Sacramento: Joint Committee on the Master Plan for Higher Education, California Legislature, 1972).

4. Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, The More Effective Use of Resources (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1972), p. 105.

Chapter VIII

1. 1972 Statistical Profile, Independent Colleges and Universities, Prepared by the AICCU Research Foundation for the Association of Independent California Colleges and Universities, August, 1972. (Draft)

APPENDIX E (continued)

2. *Ibid*.

3. *Ibid*. Data based on average student charges at 20 AICCU institutions with largest number of state scholarship students.

4. *Ibid*.

5. *State of California, Budget Supplement for Health and Welfare, Education for 1973-74* (Sacramento, 1973) p. 1271.

Chapter IX

1. *Student Resources Survey*, California State Scholarship and Loan Commission, 1972, p. ix.